DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 392 191 EC 304 622

AUTHOR Wermuth, Thomas R.; Grayson, Thomas E.
TITLE Case Studies of State-Level Cross-Disciplinary Transition Policy Implementation.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Champaign. Transition Research Inst.
SPONS AGENCY Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 95
CONTRACT H158T00001
NOTE 201p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Agency Cooperation; Case Studies; Change Strategies; Delivery Systems; *Disabilities; Educational Change; Educational Policy; Education Work Relationship; Interdisciplinary Approach; Policy Analysis; Policy Formation; Resistance to Change; *Special Education; State Programs; Systems Approach; *Transitional Programs; *Vocational Education; *Vocational Rehabilitation
IDENTIFIERS Capacity Building

ABSTRACT

This study examined processes and strategies utilized by states to implement transition policies designed to facilitate coordination of the state-level service delivery systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation. The study used a model involving four policy instruments: mandates, inducements, capacity building, and system change. Policy documents from three states, selected for their history of transition policy development and provision of comprehensive transition services, were thematically analyzed; documents included grant applications, state legislation, state regulations, state proclamations, special transition budgets, personnel training programs, and interagency agreements. Interviews with administrators and other key stakeholders in the three states were also conducted. Six major conclusions regarding state-level transition policy implementation were drawn: (1) system change appears to occur incrementally; (2) states use varying definitions of policy instruments; (3) states rely on past practice when implementing transition policies; (4) there is evidence of structural resistance within states to implement system change policies; (5) states implement symbolic policy instruments; and (6) capacity building appears linked to system change. Recommendations to improve the integration of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation are offered. An appendix includes the interview protocol. (Contains 44 references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 392 191

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Case Studies of State-Level Cross-Disciplinary Transition Policy Implementation

Thomas R. Wermuth
Thomas E. Grayson

EC304622

TRANSITION RESEARCH INSTITUTE AT ILLINOIS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Transition Research Institute Faculty
at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Janis Chadsey-Rusch, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Special Education

Thomas E. Grayson, Ph.D.
Visiting Assistant Professor of Special Education

Delwyn L. Harnisch, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Educational Psychology

Laird W. Heal, Ph.D.
Professor of Special Education

Paula D. Kohler, Ph.D.
Visiting Assistant Professor of Special Education

Lynda G. Leach, M.S.
Information Specialist

Frank R. Rusch, Ph.D.
Professor of Special Education

John S. Trach, Ph.D., CRC
Assistant Professor of Special Education and Rehabilitation

The Transition Research Institute is funded through the Office of Special Education Programs, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education (cooperative agreement number H158T-00001).

Project Officer: Michael J. Ward, Ph.D.

For more information on the Transition Research Institute at Illinois, please contact:

Dr. Frank R. Rusch, Director
College of Education
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
113 Children's Research Center
51 Gerty Drive
Champaign, Illinois 61820
(217) 333-2325

Case Studies of State-Level Cross-Disciplinary Transition Policy Implementation

Thomas R. Wermuth, Ph.D.

and

Thomas E. Grayson, Ph.D.

Transition Research Institute at Illinois

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

© 1995 by the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois

This research was supported by the Transition Research Institute in its continuing efforts to provide doctoral students with opportunities for conducting research in the field of transition services for youths with disabilities. In this regard, the major portion of this research contributed to the dissertation study of Thomas R. Wermuth.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
ABSTRACT		iv
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Primary State-Level Transition Systems	3
	The Need for Articulation	4
	Problem Statement	7
	Purpose Statement	8
2	ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK	11
	McDonnell and Elmore's (1987) Typology of Policy Instruments	12
	Policy Instruments	13
	State-Level Transition Policy Implementation	18
3	METHODOLOGY	19
	Overview of the Design	19
	Sample	20
	Data Sources	23
	Data Collection	23
	Data Analysis	24
	Limitations	25
4	RESULTS	27
	State Context and Policy Instrument Implementation	27
	State A	33
	State B	52
	State C	76
	Summary	110

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

CHAPTER		PAGE
5	DISCUSSION	111
	Cross-State Analysis	112
	Findings	131
	Conclusions	141
	Recommendations	149
APPENDIX		
A	LETTER OF INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY	153
B	INTERVIEW PROTOCOL	155
REFERENCES		157
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES		162

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Analytical Framework of Policy Instruments (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987)	14
2	State-Level Transition-Related Context Matrix Components	29
3	Transition-Related Policy Instruments Implemented in State A	40
4	Transition-Related Policy Instruments Implemented in State B	62
5	Transition-Related Policy Instruments Implemented in State C	89
6	Cross-State Comparison of Transition-Related Policy Instruments	113

Case Studies of State-Level Cross-Disciplinary Transition Policy Implementation

Thomas R. Wermuth, Ph.D.

and

Thomas E. Grayson, Ph.D.

The purpose of this study was to explain processes and strategies utilized by states to implement transition policies designed to facilitate coordination of the state-level service delivery systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation. The analysis framework used in this study was developed by Elmore (1985, 1987) and refined by McDonnell and Elmore (1987). The framework refined by McDonnell and Elmore (1987) views policy implementation options as conceptual "instruments" that act in an analogous fashion to a set of tools, designed to produce desired political outcomes. McDonnell and Elmore's (1987) framework contains four policy instruments: mandates, inducements, capacity building, and system change. The policy problem presented by the transition initiative provides an ideal opportunity to not only explain the implementation instruments used across state-level agencies focusing on a single issue but also test the use of McDonnell and Elmore's (1987) typology as a viable research framework.

To complete this study, available policy documents including: State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant applications, state legislation, state-level rules and regulations, state proclamations, special transition budgets, model demonstration projects, transition planning guides, transition planning models, personnel training programs, and interagency agreements were solicited from three states that received federal State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grants in 1991. The three states were selected based on their history of transition policy development and provision of comprehensive transition services. Thematic content analysis of the policy documents obtained from the sample states was then conducted.

Additionally, interviews with individuals managing the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grants within the sample states were conducted to validate, triangulate, and further illuminate results obtained through content analysis of state-level policy documents. Other key stakeholders from the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation were identified and interviewed using a snowball informant technique.

Six major conclusions regarding state-level transition policy implementation have been identified as a result of this study including: (a) system change appears to occur incrementally; (b) states use varying definitions of policy instruments; (c) states rely on past practice when implementing transition policies; (d) there is evidence of structural resistance within states to implement system change policies; (e) states implement symbolic policy instruments; and (f) capacity building appears linked to system change.

Five recommendations are made to assist state-level policymakers, administrators, and program developers in implementing policy instruments to integrate the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation. Recommendations include: (a) implement specific interagency policies; (b) link system change to capacity building actions; (c) conduct cross-discipline training; (d) provide state-level technical assistance; and (e) extend evaluation activities beyond the collection and reporting of student outcome data.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In order to achieve and maintain successful adult outcomes, individuals with disabilities must interact with numerous service delivery systems throughout their school and post-school lives. At no time is the concert of this interaction more critical than during the transition from school to adult life. DeStefano and Wermuth (1992) state:

> To successfully accomplish this orchestration, school personnel and others involved in transition planning must understand the demands of post-school activities and subsequently design a combination of in- and out-of-school experiences to prepare students to successfully meet those demands. (p. 541)

Therefore, policies directing the systems involved in transition planning, service provision, coordination, and evaluation should respond to the need to coordinate these activities across agencies.

The Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 1990 (Pub. L. No. 101-476), formerly known as the Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1990, defines the concept of transition from school to adult life for the first time within federal special education legislation as follows:

> The term "transition services" means a coordinated set of activities for a student, designed within an outcome-oriented process, which promotes movement from school to post-school activities, including post-secondary education, vocational training, integrated employment (including supported employment), continuing and adult education, adult services, independent living, or community participation. (Sec. 602(a)(19))

According to DeStefano and Wermuth (1992), the definition of transition services in the IDEA contains three key components including: (a) the necessity of coordination between the many individuals and agencies involved in the provision of transition services; (b) transition is an outcome-oriented process leading to the attainment of

positive adult outcomes; and (c) transition services should promote and facilitate the movement from school to a wide array of individually selected and planned post-school activities. Implementing these three components requires state education agencies (SEAs) to assist secondary schools in focusing beyond traditional academic outcomes (e.g., reading and mathematics achievement), to outcomes generally associated with adult life (e.g., employment, postsecondary education, independent living, lifelong recreation, and community integration), that are planned collaboratively between the individual, his or her family, the school, and other pertinent post-school service providers (DeStefano & Wermuth, 1992).

Other federal legislation that directs the systems of vocational education, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990 (Perkins Act of 1990) (Pub. L. No. 101-392), and vocational rehabilitation, the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1992 (Rehabilitation Act of 1992) (Pub. L. No. 102-569), also contain language, including assurances and provisions, regarding the transition of individuals with disabilities from school to adult life. Both the Perkins Act of 1990 and the Rehabilitation Act of 1992, use the same language as the IDEA when discussing transition services. All three pieces of federal legislation stress the need for coordinated interagency transition policy development, implementation, and service provision.

However, state policies that promote collaboration between agencies involved in various aspects of the transition process have not been established. According to Szymanski, Hanley-Maxwell, and Asselin (1992), "the complexity of transition is exacerbated by the imperfect interface of the service delivery systems involved" (p. 153). Failure to successfully coordinate, monitor, and evaluate the complex interactions between individuals and agencies involved in the administration and provision of transition services may diminish, impede, or sabotage the post-school outcomes obtained by individuals served by those systems and adversely affect the long-term quality of those individuals adult lives.

Primary State-Level Transition Systems

The transition from school to adult life is a complex process for all youths involving numerous actors, decisions, and activities. The outcomes obtained through this process are based, in part, on the culmination of a young adult's education, life experiences, aspirations, and plans for the future. The transitioning individual faces many challenges moving from high school to adulthood including making initial decisions about enrolling in postsecondary education, obtaining vocational or job-related training, living independently, becoming actively involved in the community, entering the military, and securing full or part-time employment. The transition from school to adult life is even more complicated for individuals with disabilities (Daniels, 1987).

The service delivery systems most frequently involved in the administration and provision of transition services for individuals with disabilities include special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation (Asselin, Hanley-Maxwell, & Szymanski, 1992; Szymanski, Hanley-Maxwell, & Asselin, 1992). When considering the interface between these three systems, it is important to note that each is authorized by different federal legislation and corresponding rules and regulations and each is administered by different branches or offices within the United States Department of Education (Szymanski, Hanley-Maxwell, & Asselin, 1992).

At the state level, each of these systems is not only directed by different federal legislative initiatives and subsequent rules and regulations but also by their own state policies, rules and regulations, bureaucratic arrangements, and administrative procedures. Due to the number of initiatives, individuals, and agencies involved in the transition process, transition policy is implemented through multi-layered structural and procedural entities that differ between states. The interaction of parallel legislative initiatives and bureaucracies between service delivery systems at both the federal and the state levels, and articulation and resource sharing between key agencies involved in transition service provision are often poor (Szymanski, Hanley-Maxwell, & Asselin, 1992).

The lack of articulation between the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation at the state-level negatively impacts relationships that exist between agencies and subsequently the array of services offered to individuals with disabilities involved in the transition process at the local level (Snauwaert & DeStefano, 1990). According to Snauwaert and DeStefano (1990), local educational agencies and post-school service providers have historically had tremendous discretion in defining their roles and responsibilities regarding the provision and evaluation of transition services. This has lead to the scattered implementation of effective programs across the United States. Snauwaert and DeStefano (1990) state:

> While local transition teams may be best suited to plan for and coordinate transition services in their area, given their in-depth knowledge of the persons, resources, and employment context of the area, state-level coordination is necessary to ensure the overall quality of transition service delivery across the state. (p. 421)

Snauwaert and DeStefano (1990) believe that policy driven consensus and coordination between state agencies, although it may be somewhat prescriptive in nature and not allow local agencies the flexibility experienced in the past, will result in more effective implementation of transition services across localities.

The Need for Articulation

State-level systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation have not traditionally operated in a coordinated manner regarding the implementation of transition-related policies and the provision of transition services (Asselin, Hanley-Maxwell, & Szymanski, 1992; DeStefano & Snauwaert, 1989; DeStefano & Wermuth, 1992; Everson, 1988; Snauwaert, 1992; Snauwaert & DeStefano, 1990; Stowitschek, 1992; Szymanski, Hanley-Maxwell, & Asselin, 1992). Szymanski, Hanley-Maxwell, and Asselin (1992) state: "In spite of common roots and shared interests, the three delivery systems have evolved separate administrations and

coordination has not always been smooth" (p. 169). Different management procedures and a lack of consensus on policy issues appears to have undermined articulation between the systems, and has negatively impacted the effectiveness of transition services provided to individuals with disabilities (Johnson, Bruininks, & Thurlow, 1987).

State agencies, primarily SEAs and vocational rehabilitation, have developed numerous transition-related policy documents designed to foster collaboration and articulation between the three systems since the mid 1980s including: state laws, state rules and regulations, state proclamations, special transition budgets, model demonstration projects, individualized transition planning guides, transition planning models, personnel training programs, and interagency agreements (DeStefano & Snauwaert, 1989; Snauwaert, 1992; Snauwaert & DeStefano, 1990; Stowitschek, 1992). According to Guba (1984), all of these documents and actions can be considered "policies," because they are designed to influence the actions and outcomes of particular individuals or groups of individuals. Guba (1984) states: "[Policy] Sources may include groups of stakeholding persons, records, documents, position papers, court decisions, and groups of experts" (p. 68).

The most frequently cited transition policy documents developed by states have been interagency cooperative agreements (Stowitschek, 1992). These agreements generally have been developed between different state agencies, most predominantly between special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation (Snauwaert & DeStefano, 1990). The salient elements contained within most state-level interagency agreements include: (a) specifying the services provided by various cooperating agencies designed to reduce duplication; (b) describing how information will be shared between and transferred across agencies; (c) detailing the extent to which cooperative transition planning will occur; and (d) outlining the procedures enabling students to exit from secondary school directly to involvement with appropriate post-school service providers without experiencing a delay or gap in services (Snauwaert & DeStefano, 1990).

Since the early 1990s with passage of the IDEA, the Perkins Act of 1990, the Rehabilitation Act of 1992, the development of cooperative agreements, and the initiation of various grant competitions, the federal government has sought to facilitate multi-agency planning focusing on transition at the state level. States have developed and used interagency agreements to create and fund new state agencies or sub-agencies designed specifically to coordinate the provision of transition services (DeStefano & Snauwaert, 1989; Snauwaert, 1992; Snauwaert & DeStefano, 1990; Stowitschek, 1992). Snauwaert and DeStefano (1990) hypothesize: "that states with extensive multi-agency planning and coordination at the state level will have greater interagency coordination resulting in effective transition service delivery at the local level" (p. 420).

In 1991, the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS), authorized under Section 626(e) of the IDEA, a grant competition entitled: "State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities," making available funds to support a series of five-year state systems change projects in transition. According to the request for proposals, detailed in the Federal Register on December 20, 1991, this grant competition was designed to:

> Enable the Secretary [U. S. Department of Education] to make one-time, five-year grants, on a competitive basis, to State vocational rehabilitation agencies and State educational agencies that submit joint applications to develop, implement, and improve transition services for youth with disabilities from age 14 through the age they exit school. (p. 66290)

The cooperative nature of this competition highlights the federal government's policy-based desire to coordinate the services provided by the primary state-level systems involved in the transition arena.

By the end of 1993, a total of 30 states were awarded State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grants. Twelve states were awarded funding in 1991, twelve additional states were awarded funding in 1992, and six final states were awarded

funding during 1993. Although a majority of states have received funding through the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities federal grant competition to enhance coordination between service delivery systems, the development, implementation, and evaluation of state-level transition policies designed to integrate the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation within those states has previously not been studied or addressed in the literature.

Problem Statement

Stowitschek (1992) describes the interaction between state and federal agencies implementing education policies as follows: "State education agencies (SEAs) often function as two-way mirrors, transmitting federal policy to local education agencies (LEAs) and reflecting the state's commitment to those policies through supporting activities" (p. 520). Similar interaction occurs within states as state-level policies are transmitted to regional or local agencies, who then attempt to support individual communities or schools to enact those policies by providing supportive activities such as inservice training or technical assistance. State agencies are required to carry out (i.e., implement) and monitor federal education and rehabilitation policy initiatives. They are directed by prescriptive federal policies and yet must be attuned to the often diverse needs, desires, and resources of local and regional agencies (Clune, 1991).

State education and rehabilitation agencies are currently attempting to implement recent federal transition-related legislation which directs the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation. Simultaneously, these agencies are attempting to enact their own state-specific transition policies. This has lead to implementation of disjointed state specific transition-related policies that haven't fostered the interface of state-level systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation (Szymanski, Hanley-Maxwell, & Asselin, 1992).

As previously mentioned, many states have developed interagency agreements and a number of states have received federal grants designed to foster coordination of the

three primary transition service delivery systems. According to Snauwaert and DeStefano (1990): "Enhanced interagency coordination is clearly intended to facilitate [transition] service delivery" (p. 412). Unfortunately, Weatherman, Stevens, and Krantz (1986) found that although a large number of interagency agreements have been developed, these agreements have done little to translate the federal goal of interagency collaboration into state-level practice.

The successful transition of individuals with disabilities from school to adult life requires changes within the traditional state-level systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation. Recent federal legislation and grant competitions have provided states with the opportunity to integrate the primary systems involved in transition service provision. However, how policies are being implemented within states to alter the administrative structure and procedures utilized to provide, coordinate, and evaluate transition services is currently unknown. The problem addressed by this study is to identify and explain how states are implementing transition policies that integrate the primary transition service delivery systems.

Purpose Statement

According to Snauwaert and DeStefano (1990), "The next five years will be critical to the future of transition service delivery" (p. 421). The future of the transition initiative and the development of viable transition policies and service delivery systems will depend primarily on the status of state-level transition policy planning, implementation, and evaluation (Snauwaert & DeStefano, 1990). The purpose of this study is to explain processes and strategies utilized by states to implement transition policies designed to facilitate coordination of the state-level service delivery systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation.

To complete this study, available policy documents including: State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant applications, state legislation, state-level rules and regulations, state proclamations, special transition budgets, model

demonstration projects, transition planning guides, transition planning models, personnel training programs, and interagency agreements were solicited from three states that received the federal State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grants in 1991. The three states were selected based on their history of transition policy development and provision of comprehensive transition services. Thematic content analysis of the policy documents obtained from the sample states was then conducted.

Additionally, interviews with individuals managing the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grants within the sample states were conducted to validate, triangulate, and further illuminate results obtained through content analysis of state-level policy documents. Other key stakeholders from the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation were identified and interviewed using a snowball informant technique. Both the thematic content analysis of policy documents and interviews with key stakeholders were guided by the research questions listed below.

Research Questions

1. How are states implementing transition-related mandates?
2. How are states implementing transition-related inducements?
3. How are states implementing transition-related capacity building policy instruments?
4. How are states implementing transition-related systems changing policy instruments?
5. How are states evaluating the implementation of transition policies?

The first through fourth research questions listed above each correspond to a policy analysis typology developed by Elmore (1985, 1987) and refined by McDonnell and Elmore (1987). McDonnell and Elmore's (1987) typology describes policy implementation options as tools or instruments to be used to solve particular problems, in this case implementation of transition policies that integrate state-level systems

coordinating transition service provision. McDonnell and Elmore's (1987) typology consists of the following four instruments: mandates, inducements, capacity building, and system changing. An analytical framework, describing each of these instruments and their expected policy effects is detailed in Chapter 2. The final research question addresses how the three sample states are evaluating the implementation of various transition-related policy instruments.

Data Management and Analysis

Data collected were analyzed using two methods. First, pertinent policy documents obtained from the sample states were analyzed through thematic content analysis, using the McDonnell and Elmore (1987) typology as a framework. Relevant sections of the policy documents obtained were copied onto a word processing program and entered into a commercially available qualitative data analysis software program to simplify management and enhance analysis. Second, transcribed interviews with key stakeholders were also managed and analyzed using the same commercially available qualitative analysis software program.

CHAPTER 2

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter describes the policy analysis framework used in this study. Delineation of the framework provides the basis for describing the systems context of states included in the sample and the research methodology utilized, which is discussed in Chapter 3. As previously noted, this framework is based on an analytical policy implementation typology developed by McDonnell and Elmore (1987). The framework detailed in this chapter provides depth to and focuses the research questions guiding this study.

Implementation of transition policies that integrate the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation has been problematic for state-level policymakers and bureaucrats (DeStefano & Snauwaert, 1989; Everson, 1989; Snauwaert, 1992). In order to more effectively coordinate the provision of transition services, the boundaries that have traditionally defined the three systems must become blurred (Snauwaert, 1992). The coordination and integration of these systems will require state-level policymakers and administrators to explore implementation of alternative policy instruments and evaluation strategies.

The most recent federal legislative actions directing special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation (i.e., IDEA; Perkins Act of 1990; Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1992, respectively) utilize similar definitions and language regarding transition. Historically however, different values, operating principles, and outcome goals associated with these systems may have inhibited their integration without the implementation of policies that included unified language and definitions, administrative structures, data sharing, funding schemes, eligibility criteria, populations served, and evaluation efforts (DeStefano & Snauwaert, 1989). Provision of integrated transition services demands significant interagency collaboration which is difficult to achieve without

implementing policies that alter or change the primary systems currently involved (Snauwaert, 1992).

McDonnell and Elmore's (1987) Typology of Policy Instruments

The policy analysis framework used in this study was developed by Elmore (1985; 1987) and refined by McDonnell and Elmore (1987). McDonnell and Elmore (1987) believe that past generations of policy analysis studies have focused on: (a) whether outcomes achieved through policy implementation were aligned with initial political desires; and (b) differences in the ways organizations respond to the implementation of various policies. The authors also believe that policy analysis needs to enter a new era examining both desired effects of policy actions and tools used in policy implementation. McDonnell and Elmore (1987) state:

> The next generation, we believe, should build upon the lessons of the first two by focusing on the instruments common to different policies and on the conditions under which those instruments are most likely to produce their intended effects. (p. 133)

By incorporating McDonnell and Elmore's (1987) view of the next generation of policy analysis, this study addresses both the desired effects (i.e., potential outcomes) and implementation strategies (i.e., policy instruments) used to direct the actions of multiple state-level agencies addressing the transition made by individuals with disabilities from school to adult life.

The framework refined by McDonnell and Elmore (1987) views policy implementation options available to policymakers and implementers as conceptual "instruments" that act in an analogous fashion to a set of tools, designed to produce desired political outcomes. McDonnell and Elmore's (1987) framework contains four policy instruments: mandates, inducements, capacity building, and system change. The analytical framework used throughout this study, including each policy instrument with

corresponding primary elements and expected effects of implementation, is presented in Table 1.

Initially, McDonnell and Elmore (1987) developed this framework to examine the effects of unified educational reform policies implemented across bureaucratic agencies. Because of the similarity between implementation of educational reform policies and transition policies that both span across multiple systems, analysis of state-level transition policy implementation provides the research opportunity to examine the viability of the framework applied to a contextually different policy problem, that includes education and other human service agencies. The policy problem presented by the transition initiative provides an ideal opportunity to not only explain the implementation instruments used across state-level agencies focusing on a single issue but also test the use of McDonnell and Elmore's (1987) typology as a viable research framework.

Policy Instruments

The defining characteristics of each policy instrument, along with intended outcomes and implementation barriers are described below. These descriptions are based upon previous work conducted by Elmore (1985, 1987) and McDonnell and Elmore (1987). In addition to descriptions of each instrument, examples of each instrument being implemented are provided for clarity and to contrast the subtle nuances that exist between them.

Mandates

Mandates are policies, usually in the form of laws, rules, and regulations, that include authority statements which govern the action of individuals and agencies and are intended to produce compliance (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). Mandates rely on authority statements, usually in the form of rules or regulations, to ensure compliance and do not entail transfer of money to ensure compliance (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). The central problem associated with mandate implementation is how to achieve an acceptable level of compliance across administrative units (Snauwaert, 1992).

Table 1

Analytical Framework of Policy Instruments (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987)

Policy Instrument	Primary Elements	Expected Effects
Mandates	Rules or Regulations (e.g., IEP objectives, service requirements)	Compliance
Inducements	Funding (Procurement) (e.g., block grants, some demonstration projects)	Production of Value, Goods, and Services; Short-Term Returns
Capacity Building	Funding or Resources (Investment) (e.g., personnel preparation grants, provision of technical assistance, information dissemination, some demonstration projects)	Enhancement of Skills, Material, Intellectual, and Human Resources; Long-Term Returns
System Change	Authority (e.g., interagency agreements, cooperative funding strategies, agency creation)	Altered Composition of Delivery Systems; Transfer of Authority Among Agencies

The benefits associated with mandates generally accrue to specific groups of individuals, such as individuals with disabilities, or to members of society at large (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). For example, when federal legislation requires industries with smokestacks to install filtration systems to reduce toxic airborne particles, this is a form of a mandate that benefits society as a whole, by reducing air pollution and increasing the quality of air. Another example is the regulation that requires educational agencies to provide a free, appropriate, public education to all school aged children, regardless of disability. Viewed initially, this mandate benefits individuals with disabilities, but it secondarily provides benefits to society at large by increasing human potential, specifically the number of working individuals that contribute to society. In order to ensure

compliance, if states do not provide a free appropriate public education to students with disabilities, they risk losing matching special education dollars provided by the federal government.

Inducements

Inducements rely on transfers of money to individuals or agencies in return for the production of goods or services (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). The expected effect of implementing an inducement is the immediate production of something of value (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). The object of value may be a program serving specific clientele, such as work incentive programs for welfare recipients, or a tangible project, such as the construction of a new bridge to foster travel or the distribution of goods and transportable services (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). The central problem associated with implementing an inducement lies in determining and allocating appropriate amounts of money and conditions for producing the desired object of value (Snauwaert, 1992).

For clarity, McDonnell and Elmore (1987) have further delineated three differences between mandates and inducements. These differences are:

1. Mandates use coercion to affect performance while inducements transfer money as a condition of performance;
2. Mandates exact compliance as an outcome while inducements are designed to elicit the production of value as an outcome; and
3. Mandates assume that the required action is something all individuals or agencies should be expected to do, while inducements assume that individuals and agencies vary in their ability to produce things of value and that the transfer of money is one way to elicit a desired action. (p. 139)

Capacity Building

Capacity building is the transfer of money or resources to individuals or agencies for the purpose of developing future benefits, generally associated with material, intellectual, or human development or growth (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). The costs

associated with capacity building implementation actions accrue to the governmental agency making the investment and society in general, usually as a portion of tax revenues (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). Capacity building, like all financial investments, carries with it the expectation of future returns, yet these returns are often uncertain, immeasurable, intangible, and distant (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987).

The central problem associated with capacity building implementation is how to ensure that innovation will be adopted and transferred across agencies (Snauwaert, 1992). This is particularly true if the capacity building policy instrument, including the transfer of funds, is time limited. The benefits of capacity building in the short term are to the recipients of funds, however, the long term beneficiaries are future members of society (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). An example of a capacity building policy is the current federal investment in science and mathematics educational development, which, it is hoped, will produce both innovative instructional materials and skilled future teachers (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). The primary difference between capacity building policies and mandates and inducements is capacity building policies have future and somewhat ambiguous effects, whereas mandates and inducements have immediate tangible effects.

The various discretionary grant programs authorized to develop model demonstration projects in transition initiated as part of Section 626(d)(3) of the IDEA are examples of capacity building instruments implemented in the field of special education. The ultimate goal of funding model demonstration projects, as well as research and evaluation technical assistance organizations to assist those projects, is to identify a wide array of working models that facilitate the transition of individuals with disabilities from school to adult life. Also, these models may, over time, transfer and generalize to other settings. Approximately 265 transition model demonstration projects have been funded since 1985.

System Change

System change policy instruments transfer authority among individuals and agencies in order to alter the systems by which public goods and services are delivered (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). The expected effect of implementing system change policies is an alteration in the bureaucratic or authority structure by which public goods and services are administered or delivered and is often accompanied by a change in the incentives which determine the nature and effects of those goods and services (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). The key outcome associated with system change policy implementation is a shift in authority between single or multiple individuals or agencies providing a publicly supported good or service (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987).

The central problem associated with implementing a system change policy is how to ensure the survival of the new bureaucratic structure (i.e., system) that may be in conflict or competition with old institutionalized structures (Snauwaert, 1992). This conflict between new and old structures may debilitate or subvert often necessary consensus building and cooperation (Snauwaert, 1992). An example of a system change policy in education is the shift created by providing parents and students the option of school choice in certain states and municipalities, "shifting education from a publicly funded quasi-monopoly to a public-private competitive market system" (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). Many individuals inside and outside education embraced school choice, while others were skeptical and actively worked to see it curtailed or eliminated.

State-Level Transition Policy Implementation

Most transition-related policies described in federal legislation that directs the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation focus on melding those systems at the state level. How state education and vocational rehabilitation systems implement those policies and potentially change in the face of new legislative actions is problematic and requires time. However, those states that were awarded State

Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grants in August of 1991 can provide initial insight into the implementation of integrated state-level transition policies.

Examining the extent to which states that received State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grants attempt to integrate the traditional systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation, each with their own federal legislation, administrations, funding formulas, service delivery mechanisms, and underlying values is a challenge. Stowitschek (1992) found a number of questions still unanswered by previous state-level transition policy analysis and cooperative planning studies including: (a) the need to plan for the development of transition databases; (b) the need to build into agencies' monitoring activities routine program evaluation that is outcome based; (c) the need to determine and promote the effective use of individualized planning procedures for transition; (d) the need to explore the potential for a single transition coordinating agency; and (e) the need to compare the benefits and shortcomings of planning activities reflected in documents and transition activities that are being implemented in order to determine which planning activities and approaches are the most functional. This study attempts to provide at least partial answers to the questions raised by Stowitschek (1992), test the utility of McDonnell and Elmore's (1987) typology as an analytic framework, and explain how select states are implementing and evaluating unified transition policy instruments across various bureaucratic systems.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Overview of the Design

A number of studies were conducted in the late 1980s and early 1990s that focused on: (a) describing the intent of federal transition policies; (b) interpreting federal transition policies by SEAs and LEAs; (c) developing state-level transition policies; and (d) identifying and describing the components included in state-level transition policies (DeStefano & Snauwaert, 1989; Everson, 1988; Repetto, White, & Snauwaert, 1990; Snauwaert, 1992; Snauwaert & DeStefano, 1990; Stowitschek, 1992). The methodologies used to complete these studies were descriptive in nature, usually involving content analysis of extant transition policy documents that were solicited and collected from lead transition personnel identified within each state.

Typically, these studies described the types of transition activities being conducted within states including: development and implementation of transition-related policies, agencies involved in transition planning, transition-related activities being conducted or coordinated by various state or private agencies, and evaluation of transition planning and service provision activities (DeStefano & Snauwaert, 1989; Snauwaert, 1992; Snauwaert & DeStefano, 1990; Stowitschek, 1992). Snauwaert and DeStefano (1990) concluded that considerable variance exists among state transition policies including the: "(a) planning, issuing, and implementing agencies; (b) plan types; and (c) [separate transition] agency creation" (p. 419).

The policies and documents that served as the data sources for the descriptive studies listed above were all developed prior to the passage of the IDEA, the Perkins Act of 1990, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1992. Therefore, previous transition policy analysis studies were conducted at a time when federal legislation did not include: a cross-system definition of transition services; a mandate requiring the initiation of transition planning beginning with high school aged students with disabilities; or delineation of the

responsibilities of various agencies regarding transition service provision, data collection, coordination, and evaluation. Additionally, former studies did not examine the effects of implementing the federal State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grants earmarked specifically for utilization by state education and vocational rehabilitation agencies. These grants, required to be cooperatively written by state education and vocational rehabilitation agencies, are designed to integrate transition policies and activities across agencies within states.

This study used two qualitative methods including: (a) thematic content analysis of extant state-level policy documents; and (b) interviews with key individuals to identify, describe, and explain the most current methods and strategies utilized by state education and vocational rehabilitation agencies to implement integrated state-level transition policies. These methods yielded contextual information explaining the implementation of policy instruments designed ultimately for systems coordination in states that received State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grants. In addition, this study clarifies how implementation of various policy instruments within selected states are being evaluated.

Sample

The recency of the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grants and the small number of states, 12, who received those grants during 1991, the initial year of the competition, suggested the use of a purposive sample for this study (Borg & Gall, 1983; Williamson, Karp, Dalphin, & Gray, 1982). Borg and Gall (1983) define a purposive sample as one: "intended to exploit competing views and fresh perspectives as fully as possible" (p. 765). Guba (1984) defines the use and selection of a purposive sample in simpler terms: "Knowing what data are wanted makes it possible to stipulate where they might be found" (p. 68).

Snauwaert and DeStefano (1990) suggested that specific, intensive policy analysis studies of a small sample of states be conducted to further understand the strategies used by state agencies to implement transition policies. The authors suggested:

> The intensity of this level of analysis may necessitate that only a few states, selected because of their representative or unique policy characteristics or because of certain attributes of the states themselves, should be the focus of such a micro-analysis. (p. 420)

As a caution to researchers working with small samples, Stake (1994) stated that: "Perhaps the most unique aspect of case study in the social sciences and human services is the selection of cases to study" (p. 243). Exceeding care was taken to select a sample of states actively involved in transition policy implementation that would yield quality information that is unique, suggested by Snauwaert and DeStefano (1990), while at the same time being representative cases, as eluded to by Stake (1994).

Three states were selected to be members of the sample. Each of these states contain both homogeneous and heterogeneous characteristics which aided in the recursive and inductive nature of this qualitative analysis. Each of the three states had a history of state-level transition policy implementation activity prior to the transition-related mandates and language included the IDEA, the Perkins Act of 1990, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1992 (DeStefano & Snauwaert, 1989; Repetto, White, & Snauwaert, 1990; Snauwaert, 1992; Snauwaert & DeStefano, 1990; Stowitschek, 1992).

The three states included in the sample actively involve the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation as key agencies in the implementation of transition-related policies and delivery of services. Finally, each of the sample states were awarded the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grants during August of 1991, the first year of the competition. Therefore, the three sample states have had time to implement cross-system transition policies.

The sample states also exhibited several marked differences, which broaden the utility of the results obtained from this study to other states grappling with transition policy implementation. The specific roles and responsibilities associated with the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation vary across sample states and each utilize the primary systems differently to implement transition policies. Additionally, the three sample states all have different bureaucratic structures, transition-related issues, and transition-specific contextual characteristics.

Due to the relatively small number of states that met all of the criteria for inclusion in the sample, specifically: receipt of the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grants during 1991; a history of transition policy activity; involvement of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation in transition-related policy implementation; and diverse bureaucratic structures; no attempt was made to select a completely representative sample that would be inclusive of all pertinent factors found in individual states across the country. As previously mentioned, because of the in-depth nature required by this type of intensive qualitative inquiry, a purposive sample was selected and utilized. To paraphrase G[illegible] (1984), having an idea about what data exists facilitates locating where that data can be found.

The information obtained from this sample of three states may be relevant and the results and conclusions generated may generalize to other state departments of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation. Other individuals, organizations, and agencies that are working to implement transition policies designed to benefit the post-school lives of youths and adults with disabilities may also benefit from the results obtained. The issue of generalization is not as critical as the role of explanation in small sample qualitative research (Stake, 1994). The explanatory nature of this study, illuminating the successes, pitfalls, and barriers experienced by a sample of states, may help state-level educational policymakers and administrators develop and utilize more effective transition initiatives and implementation strategies in the future.

Data Sources

This study used three primary data sources including: (a) successful State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant proposals from each of the three sample states; (b) state-level transition policy documents developed within each of the three states from the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation or other pertinent individuals, agencies, or organizations; and (c) interviews with key persons responsible for implementing state-level transition policies including the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grants and other potential representatives from special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation.

Data Collection

Data was collected utilizing methods that correspond to the data sources listed above. First, the successful State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant proposals were collected by the Transition Research Institute at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and were made available to the author. In addition, state-level policy documents were solicited and obtained through written correspondence and telephone contacts with respective departments of education and vocational rehabilitation in each of the sample states.

Second, telephone interviews were conducted with persons responsible for implementing transition policies and the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grants within each of the sample states. The interview protocol, included in Appendix A, was validated by faculty members from the departments of special education, vocational education, educational psychology, and vocational rehabilitation at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. The interview protocol relates directly to the research questions, listed in Chapter 1, guiding this study and correspond to the components of the McDonnell and Elmore (1987) framework.

Three key individuals were identified within each of the sample states, and each were subsequently interviewed for approximately one hour during July or August of 1993.

All of the initial stakeholders identified as interviewees agreed to participate in the study and no substitutions were necessary. Also, each interviewee was appraised of the nature of the study prior to the interview. A letter was sent to each interviewee describing the study, soliciting policy documents, and asking that they be participants (see Appendix B).

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using two methods. First, policy documents obtained during data collection were analyzed through thematic content analysis using the policy implementation instruments included in the McDonnell and Elmore (1987) typology as a framework. Thematic content analysis is a data analysis method designed to extract consistent themes from a wide range of written or verbal communication (Williamson, Karp, Dalphin, & Gray, 1982). Pertinent sections of the policy documents were copied into a word processing program and then downloaded, managed, and analyzed using commercially available qualitative data analysis software program designed for Apple Macintosh computers entitled Data Collector (Turner & Handler, 1992)

Second, interviews with key stakeholders were analyzed using the McDonnell and Elmore (1987) typology of policy implementation instruments as an analytical framework. The taped interviews were transcribed verbatim into a text word-processing file and were also downloaded, managed, and analyzed using Data Collector (Turner & Handler, 1992).

Data analysis also included an attempt to triangulate the data obtained through content analysis of state-level policy documents with the data obtained through the interviews with key stakeholders. In addition, cross-state analysis of policy instruments and evaluation strategies implemented by the sample states was conducted. Cross-state analysis assists in inducing the types of transition policy implementation strategies that appear viable in more than one location.

This study explains the instruments used by sample states to implement transition policies across the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational

rehabilitation. McDonnell and Elmore (1987) stress the need for policy analysis studies that:

> ...specify in any systemic way the relationship among the policy problem being addressed, the basic design features of a policy, the implementing organization, and the political and organizational context in which the policy targets must respond. (p. 134)

Data analysis strove to address that specification.

Limitations

Educational policy is an extremely complex and dynamic entity (Coombs, 1982). There are numerous policy options, each with undefined costs, potential benefits, and countless actors, each with different and often conflicting objectives, interacting within the policy arena (Coombs, 1982). According to Coombs (1982), "attempting to develop some understanding of its [policy] nature taxes the abilities of most scholars" (p. 590). The political intent of various policymakers and implementers is often amorphous and difficult to measure, describe, and explain.

Another limitation associated with the analysis of educational and social service policy is the conflict or disagreements that arise within the respective fields as key players advocate for different policy actions and implementation strategies. As Coombs (1982) has stated:

> The study of educational policy is further complicated by the fact that the educational process itself is marked by multiple objectives and ambiguity about goals in most institutional settings. This state of affairs, coupled with our primitive knowledge of how to reach even clearly stated goals and the inherent difficulty of evaluating educational outcomes, has kept the study of educational policy more descriptive, more historical, and more normative than policy study in some other areas such as health care, agriculture, or public transit. (p. 590)

Capturing the intent of a particular policy and the beliefs and goals of various implementers and stakeholders is problematic. There are multiple stakeholders involved in transition policy implementation and each has their own perception and understanding of existing development and implementation strategies.

Finally, the field of qualitative policy analysis focusing on the implementation of alternative policy instruments in education and social services is still in its formative stage of development. Because of the relative novelty of this research, it is not clear how the analysis will impact the development and implementation of future state-level transition policies and bureaucratic structures. Nevertheless, this study may add to the body of knowledge concerning both the implementation of integrated policies across various state-level agencies and qualitative policy analysis research methodology.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter is organized in two sections. The first section describes the state-level transition context and the categorization of policy instruments used to analyze the data. Accordingly, contextual issues that impact state-level transition policy instrument implementation are discussed and the policy instrument categorization helps to clarify how and why various policy instruments were categorized as specific instruments in the McDonnell and Elmore (1987) framework.

The second section focuses on each of the sample states and describes the transition-related context and the policy instruments implemented within each of these states. Initially, only policy instruments (i.e., mandates, inducements, capacity building, and systems changing tools) and evaluation activities implemented within each state were detailed. However, it became apparent that implementation of transition policies was imbedded in the overarching transition-related context that exists in each state. Therefore, a brief contextual description focusing on historic transition-related policy actions is included prior to discussion of transition policy instruments currently implemented within each sample state.

State Context and Policy Instrument Implementation

State-Level Transition Context

The context of each sample state is described using a matrix that combines key components from analytical matrices developed by DeStefano and Snauwaert (1990) and McDonnell and Elmore (1987). The DeStefano and Snauwaert (1990) matrix was developed as an advanced organizer for descriptively analyzing state-level transition policy actions and includes over 20 components. The matrix developed by McDonnell and Elmore (1987) is generic in nature and corresponds to contextual resources and constraints that impact the successful implementation of various policy instruments.

The matrix used in this study is specifically applied to the transition-related context that exist in each sample state and contains components found in both the DeStefano and Snauwaert (1990) and McDonnell and Elmore (1987) matrices including: bureaucratic structures, governmental capacity, fiscal resources, information sharing, and past policy choices. Each of these components is briefly defined in Table 2. A discussion of each component follows.

Bureaucratic Structure

Bureaucratic structure refers to the systems involved in transition policy implementation, service provision, evaluation, and the administrative units that direct the actions of those systems. According to McDonnell and Elmore (1987), it includes characteristics such as the: "allocation of authority among policy actors and the structure of existing agencies" (p. 146). In simpler terms, bureaucratic structure describes who is, or is at least responsible for, implementing transition policies within a given state.

Governmental Capacity

Governmental capacity, the next component included in the contextual matrix, is defined by McDonnell and Elmore (1987) as:

> The ability of the initiating level to implement a policy and the ability of the target to meet the policy's requirements. It includes the numbers and types of personnel available, their level of expertise, and relevance to the demands of particular policy instruments. (p. 146)

Therefore, governmental capacity applied to transition policy implementation requires an examination of the ability of personnel from the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation to implement transition policy initiatives. In addition, governmental capacity can also encompass the ability of local special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation personnel to carry out corresponding rules and regulations and provide services to individuals in diverse localities across the

state. This study focused specifically on state-level governmental capacity and does not address the capacity of localities that exist in each sample state.

Table 2

State-Level Transition-Related Context Matrix Components

Component	Definition
Bureaucratic Structure	Bureaucratic structure describes who is responsible for implementing transition policies within a given state.
Governmental Capacity	Governmental capacity, applied to transition policy implementation, requires examining the ability of personnel from special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation to implement transition policy initiatives.
Fiscal Resources	Fiscal resources refers to any funds specifically allocated for transition policy implementation within a state.
Information Sharing	Information sharing refers to formal and informal linkages between systems that facilitate the continuous two-way flow of information on transition policy implementation and service provision.
Past Policy Choices	Past policy choices refers to previous transition-related policies and instruments that have been implemented within a state.

Fiscal Resources, Information Sharing, and Past Policy Choices

The remaining three components of the matrix: fiscal resources, information sharing, and past policy choices are more straightforward and easily defined. Fiscal resources refers to funds specifically allocated for transition policy implementation actions within a state. Information sharing refers to the formal linkages developed between systems to facilitate the continual two-way flow of pertinent information between systems involved in transition policy implementation and service provision. Past policy choices, according to McDonnell and Elmore (1987), influence, "what the public wants from

government and how it expects goals to be accomplished" (p. 149). For example, if a state-level agency has relied on inducements in the past, it may be difficult for that system to successfully implement a different instrument such as a capacity building tool, even if the more recent policy problem calls for capacity building actions (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987).

The components of the matrix listed above provide a practical and concise method for organizing a discussion on the status of transition-related policy implementation actions that exist in each of the sample states. In addition and as previously mentioned, a discussion of the transition-related context that exists in each sample state provides a historical background on how policy implementation instruments were selected and utilized.

Policy Instrument Categorization

The policy instruments (i.e., mandates, inducements, capacity building, and system change) along with evaluation actions being conducted within each of the sample states provide the basis for presenting the results of this study. Prior to a description of the context and instruments implemented in each sample state the instruments themselves are briefly reviewed below. A more detailed description of each instrument is provided in Chapter 2.

Mandates

According to McDonnell and Elmore (1987), mandates are policies, usually in the form of laws, rules, and regulations that govern the actions of individuals and agencies and are intended to produce compliance. Mandates do not transfer money to ensure compliance but rely on rules, regulations, and authority statements to ensure compliance. Snauwaert (1992), believes that he primary problem associated with implementing mandates is how to achieve an acceptable level of compliance across administrative units using only rules and regulations.

Inducements

Inducements are transfers of money to individuals or agencies in return for the immediate production of desired goods, services, or actions (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). Unlike mandates, inducements rely on the transfer of money and corresponding conditions to ensure action. Snauwaert (1992) believes that the primary problem associated with implementing inducements is determining appropriate amounts of money and conditions for producing the desired object of value.

Capacity Building

Capacity building policy instruments transfer money or resources to individuals or agencies for the purpose of developing future benefits usually in the form of increases in material, intellectual, or human resources (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). Implementing capacity building instruments carries the expectation that a specific expenditure (i.e., investment) will most likely produce desired innovative future returns (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). The central problem associated with implementing capacity building instruments is how to ensure that successful innovations will be maintained, transferred, and adopted across agencies (Snauwaert, 1992).

System Change

System change policy instruments transfer or shift authority among individuals or agencies altering the authoritative or administrative structures delivering public goods and services (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). The anticipated effect of implementing a system change policy instrument is an alteration in the bureaucratic structure through which public goods and services are administered or delivered (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). The central problem associated with implementing system change policies is how to ensure survival of the new bureaucratic structure which may be in conflict with the old systems or structures (Snauwaert, 1992).

Evaluation

Evaluation actions, although not included in the initial McDonnell and Elmore (1987) framework but part of this analysis, are designed to judge the merit and worth of specific programs, practices, or materials (Borg & Gall, 1983). Evaluation activities are often built into capacity building and system change policy implementation instruments in order to verify that the expenditures or investments made by bureaucracies to recipients are producing the desired or intended results. Additionally, evaluation actions are usually required of recipients of any type of funding earmarked to develop model demonstration sites, whether those sites are initiated through inducements or capacity building policy instruments.

Evaluation actions are important to delineate because they can be used to verify and validate the outcomes of specific policy initiatives. In addition, evaluation can assess the selection of instruments to implement a policy. This evaluative information can be used formatively, to improve implementation strategies selected, or summatively, to assess the outcomes associated with a policy action.

In order to classify different transition-related policies into the discreet categories included in the McDonnell and Elmore (1987) typology, it was often necessary to examine the instrument along with its expected effect or intended outcome. For example, the policy instrument creating a state-level interagency organization may be a mandate or an inducement. However, once that organization is created and develops a written interagency agreement, that agreement may become a policy document itself, an entity that influences the actions of agencies and individuals. Consequently, the agreement developed by an interagency organization may be classified as a system change instrument.

Additionally, a single policy document, such as the federal State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant (State Systems grant), may be classified in a number of policy instrument categories based on its defining elements and expected effects or intended outcomes. For example, the federal State Systems grant

developed by multiple agencies in a state may include funding appropriations to hire regionally-based transition specialists who provide training and technical assistance to localities in order to upgrade the skills of transition service providers (e.g., capacity building policy instrument), simultaneously, the grant document may also include a blueprint for information, resource, and administrative sharing between state-level agencies (e.g., system change policy instrument). Therefore, different parts of a single policy document may be appropriately classified into different categories in the McDonnell and Elmore (1987) framework (L. McDonnell, personal communication, September, 1994).

The next section describes the transition-related context and the policy instruments implemented within each of the three sample states. A brief contextual description focusing on historic transition-related policy actions is included prior to discussion of the policy instruments and evaluation activities implemented within each state.

State A

Transition-Related Context

State A is in the west south central United States census region and had approximately 2,350,000 residents in 1990 (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1993). State A is very rural and has few urban centers. Primary industries in State A include tourism, poultry production, materials distribution, and farming (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1993).

State A has been at the forefront of extending school-to-work transition services to all high school students, including individuals with disabilities, in the United States. It has a history of supporting and valuing vocational education programs at both the secondary and postsecondary levels. In 1990, the legislature initiated a program requiring all secondary students attending public schools to enroll in a minimum of two credits of vocational education in order to graduate from high school (State A Act 969 of 1990). Although not directly related with the transition made by individuals with disabilities from

school to adult life, this requirement complements the overarching school-to-work activities that are currently being implemented in State A.

Bureaucratic Structures

The systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation have been involved in transition policy implementation in State A since the passage of the IDEA and the Perkins Act of 1990. The state vocational education and vocational rehabilitation agencies, along with the vocational rehabilitation department at the major state university, have historically been the key agencies implementing transition policies and directing transition service provision actions. In July of 1993, the state vocational rehabilitation system lost its autonomy and became a division of the vocational education system within the SEA (State A Act 574 of 1993).

A key transition-related structural organization in State A is the Governor's Interagency Council on Self Sufficiency (ICSS). Developed in 1989, the ICSS: "exists to oversee the development, implementation, and evaluation of a statewide process to transition youth with disabilities from school to inclusive post-secondary education, employment, and community living" (State A State Systems grant, 1991, p. 19). In order to accomplish these goals, the ICSS relies on the expertise of representatives from special education, vocational education, vocational rehabilitation, and approximately twenty additional public and private agencies to oversee transition-related policy implementation and service provision activities being conducted at the state-level.

State A received a federally funded State Systems grant in 1991. This grant is managed through the state special education agency. The initial director and key author of this grant, a former advocate trainer for parents of children with disabilities employed by the state special education agency, has worked closely with the ICSS to integrate transition-related policy development, implementation, and service provision. The grant director has become the key individual from special education at the state-level working on transition-

related policy implementation, however, she has left this position to head the State A school-to-work initiative.

In addition to the state-level agencies listed above, the vocational rehabilitation department at the major state university has also been a key player in transition-related policy implementation in State A. A nationally recognized faculty member from the vocational rehabilitation department at the major state university, who was referred to by all three of the interviewees from State A as a key transition leader, has been hired to evaluate the outcomes attained by the State Systems grant. This individual also works as a member of the ICSS and as an advisor to most state-level transition policy implementation actions that are undertaken. The evaluation of the federal grant is currently being conducted and initial data will be collected during the 1994-1995 academic year.

Governmental Capacity

As previously mentioned, the ICSS is the primary transition-related policy implementation body that exists in State A. The director of the State Systems grant serves as chairperson of the ICSS, which meets quarterly, usually in the capitol city. The grant director also represents special education on the ICSS.

The ICSS is responsible for implementing and coordinating transition policies. According to the State Systems grant: "The ICSS [is] the body which makes recommendations to agency directors and other policy makers regarding the transition needs, interests, and preferences of students/families" (1991, p. 19). Members of the ICSS are also involved in dissemination and training activities across the state. These training activities are designed to assist in the development of local core teams at each high school that parallel the ICSS membership and activities at the state-level.

The special education system in State A has traditionally had little capacity to implement transition related policies. Although state-level special education legislation has been enacted that parallels the mandates and language regarding the provision of transition-related services initiated in the IDEA, no state-level money or personnel outside of the

funds provided and individuals hired through the State Systems grant are involved in transition-related policy implementation. According to the director of the State Systems grant, the capacity of special education to implement transition-related policies and service provision activities is still in its inchoate stage of development.

Vocational education and vocational rehabilitation have also been implementing state-level legislation that parallels the transition-related assurances included in the Perkins Act of 1990 and the Rehabilitation Act of 1992, respectively. In addition, vocational education receives funding from the state legislature to more effectively provide access and serve individuals with special needs, including individuals with disabilities involved in the transition process, enrolled in vocational education programs (State A Act 969 of 1990).

Fiscal Resources

State A has received approximately $500,000 per year from 1991 to 1994 and will receive an additional $500,000 in 1995 through receipt of the federal State Systems grant (1991-1995). Most of the funds obtained through this federal grant are spent on staff and developmental training activities conducted throughout the state. In addition to funding personnel and training activities, a portion of the grant funds have gone to secondary schools to develop or enhance state sponsored model demonstration sites, primarily focusing on developing local interagency transition teams.

Seven schools in State A have been given $1,000 per year from the federal grant to fund transition-related activities at the local-level. These model demonstration site funds can be spent on various unspecified transition-related activities, for example, "as stipends to reimburse substitutes so that those key players in the school can have time to conduct teaming activities" (State A State Systems grant, 1991, p. 6). However, the focus of the model sites is on conducting teaming activities. The seven schools that received funding are considered model demonstration sites and are periodically asked by personnel from state agencies or members of the ICSS to present their models at various conferences and workshops held throughout the state.

The State A legislature has provided the vocational education system with $998,878 to augment services and accommodations, including transition-related activities for youths and adults with special needs enrolled in vocational education programs (State A Act 969 of 1990). It should be noted that individuals with disabilities comprise only a small portion of students with special needs identified and served by vocational education. This nominal category includes, for example, individuals who are economically or academically disadvantaged, displaced homemakers, and teen parents. These state-level vocational education funds are allocated to secondary and postsecondary vocational education programs without stipulation as how they should be spent as long as the activities are targeted to assist individuals with disabilities.

These vocational education funds have been used in a variety of ways such as purchasing assistive technology to facilitate entry into vocational education programs, purchasing advertisements designed to recruit individuals with special needs into nontraditional vocational education programs, as well as transition-related activities such as job placement and training. An interviewee from vocational education was unable to specify how much of that money was being used to implement transition-related policies or service provision activities.

Outside of the federal funds obtained through the State Systems grant and the state-level funds allocated to vocational education, State A has not authorized any state-level special education or vocational rehabilitation funds specifically for transition-related activities.

Information Sharing

Developing communication linkages between individuals and agencies involved in transition policy implementation and service provision is a major goal of the State A State Systems grant. This grant is designed:

> To develop, implement, and improve transition services for youth through systems change to bring about outcome oriented education, improve adult service delivery

systems, inclusive employment and living options, and improve linkages among participating entities. (State A State Systems grant, 1991, p. 3)

The concept of developing linkages between state agencies is a basic tenet of the transition process and signifies an effort to enhance information sharing. Additionally, systemic linkages can lead to the development and implementation of integrated transition policies at the state-level that may result in collaborative local service provision activities.

State-level information sharing is also a goal of the ICSS. The ICSS is charged with, "Improving and expanding transition services by linking education, rehabilitation, and other agencies, and local communities in a coordinated effort to better serve individuals with disabilities" (State A State Systems grant, 1991, p. 2). Additionally, the ICSS is in the process of developing a state-level interagency agreement with the full support of the Governor and other agency representatives on the committee.

Past Policy Choices

The State A legislature enacted state-level education and rehabilitation legislation before passage of Pub. L. No. 94-142 in 1975. Current education and rehabilitation legislation is not as prescriptive as corresponding federal legislation and generally repeats the language and intent of corresponding federal initiatives. All interviewees expressed concern that their state is not authorizing any consistent state-level funding specifically for transition and they believe that an increase would facilitate transition-related policy implementation and service provision.

No significant changes have been made in state-level legislation that alters the transition-related language, service provision mandates, and assurances included in the IDEA, the Perkins Act of 1990, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1992. The one exception of going beyond the minimum floor of rules and regulations set by federal legislation is the authorization and appropriation of set-aside funds earmarked specifically for individuals with special needs in the state's vocational education legislation. At the federal level, these set-aside funds were removed in the Perkins Act of 1990.

State-level special education legislation regarding transition requires school districts to conduct transition planning as part of the Individualized Educational Planning (IEP) process for all special education students beginning at age 16, or age 14 when appropriate, and to monitor the provision of those services (State A Act 294 of 1990). Individuals with disabilities are assured equitable access to vocational education programs and vocational educators should assist in transition planning activities for individual students when appropriate (State A Act 969 of 1990). Vocational rehabilitation is required to actively participate in transition planning and anticipate the future rehabilitation needs of students with disabilities involved in the transition process (State A Act 1226 of 1993).

Policy Instrument Implementation

A list of the policy instruments implemented in State A is included in Table 3. In addition to listing the policy instruments currently being implemented, Table 3 includes information regarding the implementing agencies, policy actions, and expected effects or outcomes associated with each of the instruments. The information provided in Table 3 serves as an organization tool and guides the following discussion.

Mandates

Special education legislation. State A enacted special education legislation, State A Act 294 of 1990 (Act 294), designed to guide the provision of transition-related services to students with disabilities shortly after similar transition-related language and mandates were enacted through the IDEA. Act 294 defined transition-related services and mandated the provision of transition-related activities. Act 294 mandates include: (a) defining the term 'transition-related services;' (b) providing a partial list of activities that comprise appropriate transition-related services that could be planned for individual students; (c) requiring that transition planning begin when students reach age 16 as part of the annual IEP process; and (d) outlining the responsibilities of local special education agencies to monitor the provision of transition-related services included on IEPs. There are no funds

Table 3

Transition-Related Policy Instruments Implemented in State A

Policy Instrument	Implementing Agency	Policy Actions	Expected Effects or Outcomes
Mandates			
Act 294 of 1990 (State Special Education Legislation)	State Education Agency, Special Education.	(a) Defines transition-related services; (b) Lists activities that comprise transition services; (c) Requires transition planning; and (d) Delineates special education's responsibility to plan and monitor transition service provision.	Compliance with definitions, transition planning actions, and monitoring responsibilities.
Act 969 of 1990 (State Vocational Education Legislation)	State Education Agency, Vocational Education.	(a) Assures individuals with disabilities equal access to vocational education programs; (b) Assures that vocational education assist in transition planning; (c) Cites special education legislation definition of transition-related services; and (d) Requires all high school students to enroll in vocational education.	Compliance with assurances regarding vocational education involvement in transition planning and requirement that all high school students enroll in vocational education.

(table continues)

Table 3 (continued)

Policy Instrument	Implementing Agency	Policy Actions	Expected Effects or Outcomes
Act 1226 of 1993 (State Vocational Rehabilitation Legislation)	State Education Agency, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation Division.	(a) Assures that vocational rehabilitation assist in transition planning; and (b) Cites special education legislation definition of transition-related services.	Compliance with assurance that vocational rehabilitation be involved in transition planning.
Inducements			
Funding authorized by Act 969 of 1990 (State Vocational Education Legislation)	State Education Agency, Vocational Education.	(a) Encourages vocational education to be involved in transition planning; and (b) Broadens access to vocational education programs to individuals with disabilities (equal access).	(a) Vocational education involvement in transition planning. (b) Equal access to vocational education programs.
Funding appropriated within the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant (1991)	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation Division, and others.	(a) Develops model transition demonstration sites across localities, (b) Develops and supports local transition planning teams; and (c) Recruits and hires regional transition specialists to implement the statewide model (e.g., local interagency teams).	(a) Functional model transition demonstration projects. (b) Employment of six regional transition personnel. (c) Functional local transition planning teams.

(table continues)

Table 3 (continued)

Policy Instrument	Implementing Agency	Policy Actions	Expected Effects or Outcomes
Capacity Building			
Employment of six regional transition specialists through the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant (1991)	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation Division, and others.	(a) Provides statewide training (e.g., workshops, preservice, and inservice); (b) Provides statewide technical assistance (e.g., mail and telephone); and (c) Provides information dissemination (e.g., best practices, pertinent literature).	(a) Upgraded skills of transition service providers. (b) Enhanced transition services and programs. (c) Informed and knowledgeable transition service providers. (d) Increased utility of information and decision-making strategies.
System Change			
Establishment of the Governor's Interagency Council on Self Sufficiency (1989)	Governor's Office in conjunction with State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation Division, State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant personnel, and others.	(a) Advises in the development and implementation of transition policies; and (b) Advises in the evaluation of transition policy development, implementation, and outcomes.	(a) Comprehensive transition policies. (b) An evaluation report that is useful to policy makers, program managers, and local service providers.

(table continues)

Table 3 (continued)

Policy Instrument	Implementing Agency	Policy Actions	Expected Effects or Outcomes
State-level Interagency Agreement (Governor's Interagency Council on Self Sufficiency, 1991)	Governor's Office in conjunction with State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation Division, State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant personnel, and others.	(a) Explores resource and information sharing between state-level agencies; (b) Transfers authority between state-level agencies (e.g., sharing authority); and (c) Creates a state-level model interagency agreement.	(a) Coordinated and integrated transition-related systems. (b) Reduced gaps or delays in services provided to clients between agencies (i.e., seamless system of transition services). (c) A replicable model of interagency agreement to be used by local communities.
Blueprint for state-level systems change (State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant document, 1991)	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation Division, and others.	(a) Clarifies interagency roles and responsibilities of state-level agencies; (b) Develops regional and local transition interagency teams; and (c) Assists in guiding interagency planning and collaboration.	Altered arrangement of state-level agencies implementing transition-related services.
Composition of state-level systems altered by Act 574 of 1993 (State Vocational Education Legislation)	State Education Agency, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation Division.	(a) Transfers authority of Vocational Rehabilitation to Vocational Education; (b) Integrates Vocational Rehabilitation into Vocational Education system; and (c) Coordinates service provision between vocational education and vocational rehabilitation.	(a) Coordinated and integrated transition-related services. (b) Reduced gaps or delays in services provided to clients moving between agencies (i.e., seamless system of transition services).

(table continues)

Table 3 (continued)

Policy Instrument	Implementing Agency	Policy Actions	Expected Effects or Outcomes
Evaluation			
Formative and summative evaluation of state-level policy implementation and outcomes (Governor's Interagency Council on Self Sufficiency, 1989)	Governor's Office in conjunction with State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation Division, State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant personnel, and others.	(a) Identifies service delivery gaps that exist in policies and procedures; (b) Guides the development of new and revised transition policies and service delivery procedures; and (c) Determines the outcomes obtained by individuals involved in the transition process.	An evaluation of the development, implementation, and outcomes associated with transition-related policy implementation and service provision.
Formative and summative evaluation of State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant (1991)	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation Division, and others.	(a) Supports the development of a statewide needs assessment; (b) Develops a local follow-up system; and (c) Conducts periodic surveys of LEAs, service providers, students, and parents to assess project impact.	(a) Decisions on project implementation (i.e., modification, revision, discontinuation). (b) Decisions on planning and development of interventions and strategies (i.e., modification, revision, discontinuation). (c) Dissemination of final evaluation report. (d) Fulfills grant evaluation requirement.

authorized by Act 294 and the expected effect of the mandates included in Act 294 is to elicit compliance from local special education agencies.

Vocational education legislation. State A legislature enacted vocational education legislation that includes assurances designed to elicit compliance by secondary and postsecondary vocational education programs through State A Act 969 of 1990 (Act 969). Act 969 restates the assurances provided to individuals with disabilities detailed in federal vocational education legislation, the Perkins Act of 1990. Those assurances include: (a) assuring that individuals with disabilities have equal access to vocational education programs; (b) assuring that vocational education representatives assist in transition planning activities when appropriate; and (c) citing the special education legislation definition of the term 'transition-related services.'

Additionally, Act 969 mandates that all students, including individuals with disabilities, enroll in a minimum of two credits of vocational education in order to graduate from high school. This requirement is not included in the Perkins Act of 1990 and highlights the importance of vocational education in State A, particularly as it relates to recent school-to-work legislation at the federal level. Act 969 also illustrates the willingness of the legislature to enact more prescriptive mandates than the theoretical floor established federally through the Perkins Act of 1990.

Vocational rehabilitation legislation. After the Rehabilitation Act of 1992 was passed at the federal level, State A enacted parallel state-level vocational rehabilitation legislation through State A Act 1226 of 1993 (Act 1226). Act 1226 assures that vocational rehabilitation counselors participate in transition planning and cites the special education definition of transition-related services. Act 1226 is designed to produce compliance with the transition planning assurance listed above.

The precedent has been set in State A to develop mandates that go beyond the minimum floor established through federal legislation (e.g., two-credit vocational education requirement enacted in State A Act 969 of 1990). The vocational education system is

required to implement mandates not included in the Perkins Act of 1990, some of which, however, relate only peripherally to transition-related policies and service provision. However, the legislation that directs the systems of special education and vocational rehabilitation is not more prescriptive than the corresponding federal legislative mandates and assurances included in the IDEA and the Rehabilitation Act of 1992, respectively.

Inducements

State A is currently implementing two transition-related inducements deigned to have immediate positive statewide impact. The first inducement enacted is the appropriation of state-level vocational education funds (approximately $1,000,000) to better serve individuals with special needs enrolled in vocational education programs (State A Act 969 of 1990). This money is provided to secondary and postsecondary vocational education programs, on a per pupil basis, to induce a wide array of actions including encouraging vocational educators to be involved in transition planning and providing qualified individuals with disabilities access to varied and non-traditional vocational education programs. However, according to an interviewee from the vocational education system, it is not possible to identify exactly how much of those funds are being used to specifically support transition-related activities serving individuals with disabilities. It can safely be assumed, however, that at least a portion of the funds earmarked to serve special needs students are being used to provide transition-related services to individuals with disabilities.

The second inducement used in State A relates to federal funding appropriated through the State Systems grant. A portion of the funds received from the federal grant have been used to create local model demonstration sites within the state through a state-level competitive grant process. Beginning in 1991, these model demonstration sites, all of which were awarded to local high schools, are provided with $1,000 per year and will continue through 1995 to conduct teaming activities around transition issues. These funds

are primarily designed to encourage localities to develop local transition planning teams and conduct ancillary teaming activities.

In addition to funding model demonstration sites, the majority of funds received by the State Systems for Transition Services for Youths with Disabilities grant have been used to recruit and hire six regional transition specialists to facilitate implementation of the state model. These six transition specialists focus on assisting the model demonstration sites, and others, to develop local transition planning teams. The transition specialists also assist the model demonstration sites and others working on implementing transition-related policies and providing transition services.

Each of the individuals interviewed expressed concern that State A had not allocated any state-level funds specifically for transition-related activities. The three interviewees stated that funding was extremely limited across State A for all transition-related education and rehabilitation activities. Additionally, the interviewees were distressed over the potential lack of future state-level funds available for transition-related policy implementation and service provision.

Capacity Building

The employment of six regional transition specialists through the federal State Systems grant received in 1991 is the sole capacity building policy instrument implemented in State A. Specifically, the capacity building policy implementation actions conducted by the transition specialists include statewide training, technical assistance, and information dissemination activities. These activities are designed to assist localities to develop local core teams that will parallel the structure and function of the state-level transition-related interagency team (i.e., the ICSS).

Using funds from the State Systems grant, six state-level transition specialists were hired and placed in four regional offices. These staff members are supervised by the grant director and conduct and coordinate various transition-related capacity building policy

actions. Additionally, one of the interviewees stated that the development of regional offices is designed to foster the link between the state and local interagency teams.

System Change

There are four system change policy instruments being implemented in State A. The first is the development of the Governor's Interagency Council on Self Sufficiency. According to the ICSS charter written in 1989, the ICSS was initiated by a former governor to facilitate the:

> ...implementation of a state interagency agreement, training and assignment of regional staff, barrier resolution, monitoring referral processes, data collection and analysis, philosophical input, training, policy analysis and development, and informing and reporting to policy makers. (p. 11)

All the ICSS functions listed above are in formative stages of development. Additionally, a number of these functions are included as part of the State A State Systems grant. It appears that receipt of the federal grant spurred the initiation of interagency planning activities within State A.

Development of the ICSS. The development of the ICSS aligns with McDonnell and Elmore's (1987) assumptions regarding system change policy instrument implementation, that current systems, with existing incentives, might not be able to produce the desired results, therefore, new authority structures need to be developed (p. 143). The development of a multi-agency cooperative working group is a policy attempt to alter the administrative units overseeing the services provided to individuals with disabilities involved in the transition process to help them attain desired post-school outcomes. Because this instrument is still in a formative stage of implementation, it is unclear whether the ICSS will ultimately alter the systems providing transition services and whether those alterations will increase the number of individuals with disabilities that make the successful transition from school to adult life.

Development of a state-level interagency agreement. The second system change policy instrument also relates to the ICSS. However, the focus is on the interagency agreement being developed by the ICSS. The agreement, signed by over twenty state and private agencies, has three primary functions. First, the statewide interagency agreement discusses potential resource and information sharing between the cooperating agencies. Second, the statewide interagency agreement discusses the transfer (i.e., sharing) of authority between agencies involved in transition-related policy implementation and service provision. Third, the statewide interagency agreement creates a state-level model that can be emulated by communities to alter the authority of agencies involved in transition-related policy implementation and service provision at the local-level.

State Systems grant provides a blueprint for system change. The third system change policy instrument implemented is the State Systems grant document itself. The grant document provides a blueprint for integrating transition-related service provision. Specifically, the grant states:

> The project will improve and expand transition services throughout the state by linking education, rehabilitation, other human service programs, and local communities in a coordinated effort to serve youth with disabilities. (State A State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant, 1991, p. 2)

The expected effect of implementing this policy instrument designed to integrate transition-related service provision may potentially alter the systems and procedures of providing those services to individuals in need. Integrating services also implies that the composition of the systems providing transition-related services will be altered. These alterations align with McDonnell and Elmore's (1987) description of system change policy instruments.

Vocational rehabilitation is moved into the vocational education system. The fourth system changing policy instrument implemented in State A entails folding the formerly autonomous vocational rehabilitation system into the vocational education system (State A '

Act 574 of 1993). Combining systems alters the "structure by which public goods and services are delivered," defined by McDonnell and Elmore (1987, p. 140) as a tenet of system changing policy instruments.

Because these formerly discreet systems will now be directed by one individual, it was assumed by two of the three interviewees that those systems will become closely aligned, sharing resources and integrating policies to provide better services and ease administrative barriers. The integration of these two systems serves to strengthen vocational education, which is already viewed as a strong system at the national level. It is not clear at the present time how this integration will effect the school to work transition initiative for all students being implemented in State A.

Evaluation

A considerable amount of emphasis has been placed on evaluation activities in State A. All of the interviewees and several policy documents stressed the perceived importance of policy implementation and transition outcome studies being conducted by faculty members from the major state university department of vocational rehabilitation. Each of these evaluation actions stems from either the ICSS or the State Systems grant.

The first evaluation activity is designed to (a) identify service delivery gaps that exist in state-level policies and procedures; (b) guide the development of new and revised policies and procedures based on the service delivery gaps previously identified; and (c) determine the outcomes obtained by individuals involved in the transition process. The evaluation activities being conducted by the ICSS correspond to the evaluation activities being conducted as part of the requirements established with receipt of the federal State Systems grant.

The second evaluation activity examines the processes utilized by and the effectiveness of the State Systems grant. This analysis, to be completed by January of 1996, is required of the State Systems grant. The grant states:

> A proposed policy analysis will identify gaps in policies and procedures and guide the development of new and revise policies for education and human services. In addition, the most significant factors assuring need fulfillment and local ownership and youth and family awareness, understanding and empowerment resulting in state and local policies and procedures to insure the ongoing nature of activities initiated through the project. Finally, an evaluation will provide information about the overall success of the project in implementing change and the impact of the project on youth and their families. (1991, p. 6)

In addition, this evaluation will examine the effectiveness of the model demonstration sites.

One part of the evaluation activity described above, according to one interviewee, is a "policy implementation analysis which looks at IEPs and the process by which they are developed at the local level to include the transition mandates included in federal legislation" (Interviewee from State A Major State University, personal communication, July 7, 1993). This evaluation will compare the IEPs from a sample of schools throughout the state to the seven schools that are designated as demonstration sites. It is anticipated that this evaluation activity, to be completed by the summer of 1994, will provide examples of how to successfully write IEPs for students that comply with the federal regulations while, at the same time, meet the needs of individuals with disabilities involved in the transition process at the local level. The results of this evaluation may be disseminated and used as a capacity building instrument in the future.

State A Summary

State A is currently implementing varied transition policies. However, State A relies primarily on mandates, capacity building, and system change policy instruments. The low number of inducements may be due to the fact that State A has not authorized any funding specifically for transition-related policy implementation and service provision activities. According to all of the persons interviewed, the lack of state-level funding has

impeded transition-related policy implementation and service provision throughout the state.

State B

Transition-Related Context

State B is located in the west north central United States census region and had a population of approximately 4,375,000 residents in 1990 (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1993). State B includes one single large metropolitan region that encompasses two cities and is sparsely populated outside of that urban center. Some of the primary industries in State B include tourism, farming, and high tech administrative operations such as airline management, financial management, insurance corporation headquarters, and computer hardware and software research and development (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1993).

State B is known for its progressive educational policies including instituting charter schools and implementing extensive school choice options for students and their parents. Students from State B usually rank at or near the top of the United States on annual achievement test score and college entrance exam results. In addition, State B has implemented very prescriptive legislation regarding the quantity and quality of services provided to individuals with disabilities, in school and as adults.

Historically, State B has been a leader in the development and implementation of transition policies. In 1985, five years before transition was defined and transition-related services were mandated in federal legislation, legislation in State B authorized the development of the Interagency Office on Transition Services (IOTS). Housed within the state department of education, the IOTS was "formed to provide leadership to state and local communities in facilitating the transition of students from school to work and community living" (State B State Systems grant, 1991, p. 6). The IOTS receives part of its funding from education and part from vocational rehabilitation. The IOTS is an integrated agency designed to integrate the key systems involved in transition policy implementation and service delivery.

Faculty from the major state university have been key actors in the development, implementation, and evaluation of transition policies implemented in State B. Special education and vocational education faculty have been conducting basic and applied research activities focusing on transition since the early 1980s. An outgrowth of university involvement in the transition arena was legislation authorizing the development of the State Transition Interagency Committee (STIC) and corresponding Community Transition Interagency Committees (CTICs) (State B Law Number 120.17, 1987). These committees were charged to conduct various activities across geographic regions in the state. These activities are detailed in the bureaucratic structures section below.

State B is the home of a nationally recognized parent oriented and operated education, training, advocacy, and service delivery center. This parent center, according to one interviewee, "is able to exert political pressure and has been instrumental in initiating state-level transition legislation, including acts that prescribe the provision of various indirect and direct transition services" (Interviewee from the State B Major State University, personal communication, July, 21, 1993). In addition to working with policymakers, the parent center also works with community groups throughout the state to develop service options focusing on employment, housing, transportation, and assistive technology.

Bureaucratic Structures

Instead of developing separate transition offices within the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation, State B legislation passed in 1985, requires these systems to pool resources and create a single agency that focuses on transition (State B Law Number 118.10, 1985). This agency, the IOTS, is housed in the State Educational Agency (SEA) and is funded by both education and vocational rehabilitation. Approximately $80,000 per year is allocated to operate the IOTS. These funds are used primarily to hire one professional staff person and one administrative assistant. In addition, funding appropriated from the federal State Systems grant is used to

hire two additional professional staff persons and an administrative assistant to work with the IOTS director. The IOTS is designed to coordinate state-level training, technical assistance, and information dissemination activities.

In addition to the IOTS, the STIC was created through State B legislation in 1987 (State B Law Number 120.17, 1987). Members of the STIC, which includes representatives from various state-level agencies, developed the following mission statement agreeing that:

> Each agency supports the development of regulations, policies, and practices for establishing multidisciplinary interagency teams, including the student or client and parent(s), to plan services necessary to meet the anticipated transition needs of each individual. (State B Law Number 120.17, 1987, p. 3)

The STIC mission statement was described as a catalyst to transition activity across state-level systems by one of the interviewees from the SEA. The goal of the STIC "is to improve transition services through interagency cooperative planning, commitment of resources, and information sharing" (State B State Systems grant, 1991, p.1).

Guided by the STIC, State B developed an extensive interagency agreement in 1987 that was signed by over 10 state agency representatives. The interagency agreement acknowledged that: "effective service delivery will require close collaboration and flexing of policy as we work together on developing and implementation of transition plans" (State B Interagency Agreement, 1987, p. 1). The four broad goals of this agreement include:

1. To plan, provide, and fund services;
2. To allocate staff time for statewide coordination of transition planning and programming;
3. To support collaborative planning as we collectively attempt to meet the needs of each individual child; and

4. To enter into more specific joint agreements as necessary to achieve the objectives of smooth and effective transition. (State B Interagency Agreement, 1987, p. 1)

In addition to developing the STIC, the legislature also required development of CTICs across the entire state (State B Law Number 120.17, 1987). CTICs are locally-focused and consist of appropriate transition-related service providers, advocates, and representatives within a single school district, group of districts, or special education cooperative region, depending on the population and geographical characteristics of each locality. Members serving on CTICs may include representatives from special education, vocational education, regular education, community education, postsecondary education, parents, local businesses, and public and private adult service providers.

Through the development of the IOTS, STIC, and CTICs, State B has created unique transition-related bureaucratic structures. The creation of new structures is one of the characteristics of systems change policy instruments described by McDonnell and Elmore (1987). To be successful, the creation of new systems or structures requires that traditional systems lose or give up some autonomy and are willing to allow the new agency to grow without subverting or co-opting its existence. Currently, it appears that the stakeholders in State B support the existence of these multi-agency organizations focusing on transition.

Governmental Capacity

Governmental capacity refers to the ability of state agencies and local service providers and monitors (i.e., targets) to develop, implement, and evaluate policy actions. In State B the IOTS and STIC are both directly involved in state-level policy development, implementation, technical assistance, information dissemination, and evaluation. In addition, each CTIC is responsible for local transition-related policy actions. Although the IOTS is a small office, consisting of one professional staff member and one administrative assistant, it is viewed as the state-level agency that coordinates and conducts transition-

related leadership activities. As previously mentioned, the IOTS provides leadership by focusing on increasing the knowledge and ability of school and post-school service providers to better serve individuals involved in the transition process.

The STIC is a multi-agency organization charged with coordinating the development, implementation, and evaluation of transition-related policies across state-level agencies. The director of the IOTS is also a member of the STIC. As mentioned, the STIC is the organization responsible for developing and monitoring the implementation of the State B transition interagency agreement.

The CTICs, which exist throughout the state, are locally developed multi-agency teams focusing on direct transition-related service provision and evaluation activities. The STIC transmits state-level transition policy information to the CTICs, which in turn, provide evaluative information and feedback to the STIC. In addition, the IOTS is available to provide each CTIC with pertinent requested transition-related training, technical assistance, and general information dissemination.

State B has developed an effective system of transmitting transition policy information between state and local individuals and agencies. The STIC, with input and assistance provided by the IOTS, is capable of developing, implementing, and evaluating transition policies, based on information collected from key state and local stakeholders. The STIC also facilitates the implementation of those policies through contact with the CTICs. All of the interviewees from State B expressed satisfaction with the capacity of these systems to implement transition policies. Additionally, the interviewees thought that state-level policies responded to the informational needs generated at the local service delivery level.

Fiscal Resources

State B uses a combination of state funds appropriated by the legislature and federal dollars from the State Systems grant to implement transition-related policies. The IOTS receives approximately $80,000 appropriated by the legislature each year to hire staff and

conduct training, technical assistance, and information dissemination activities. In addition, federal funds received through the State Systems grant are also used to hire state-level staff and to induce local communities to initiate or enhance activities conducted by CTICs. In an effort to coordinate transition-related policy actions and service provision, the director of the IOTS administers the federal State Systems grant.

State-level funding is appropriated by the legislature to the SEA and vocational rehabilitation. Transition-specific funds are then filtered to the IOTS. According to one interviewee, funding for transition originated with the set-aside requirements included in the initial Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984. Funding from vocational education was the original source of funds for transition in State B in the early 1980s.

Funding for IOTS staff, space and equipment, travel, and training and technical assistance, was initially appropriated by the state legislature in 1985 (State B Law Number 118-10, 1985). Since then, funding has been re-appropriated every biennium. The IOTS has a very broad mission, essentially to provide statewide leadership. However, the role of the IOTS as a link between state-level policymakers, the STIC, the major state university, and the CTICs has been critical to the success of transition policy implementation. Even though the IOTS is small, the impact of the IOTS was verified by each of the interviewees. According to one interviewee from the major state university: "Having the IOTS as a separate administrative entity, funded by both education and vocational rehabilitation, has been the key to transition in this state" (Interviewee from State B Major State University, personal communication, July 21, 1993).

Funds received through the State Systems grant are used for conducting a variety of transition-related activities. The majority of these funds have been used to hire two educational specialists and one administrative assistant. These educational specialists work with the director of the IOTS, who also serves as director of the federal grant, primarily providing training, technical assistance, and information dissemination to CTICs.

In 1991, the State Systems grant also made available one-time $1000 grants to localities to further develop CTICs. Since 1992, each prescribed CTIC catchment area could apply for an additional $1000 per year to conduct one or more of the following transition-related activities:

1. Identifying and cataloging information on proven models and exemplary programs and practices that have emerged out of other research and demonstration projects on transition in [State B] and nationally;
2. Promoting the exchange of information on existing exemplary practices and innovations among service providers and CTICs statewide;
3. Providing opportunities for CTICs and other community-level organizations and groups to apply for demonstration funds to demonstrate innovations in transition practices locally;
4. Making available technical assistance, training, and consultation to each demonstration project funded; and
5. Evaluating and documenting the impact and outcomes of these demonstration activities, and disseminating information about these innovations to other CTICs, school districts, and community service agencies statewide. (State B State Systems grant, 1991, p. 3)

The State B legislature also appropriated $500,000 during the 1991-1992 biennium to be awarded on a competitive basis to centers for independent living "to work with students in schools to facilitate the transition from school to community living" (State B Law Number 124.18, 1991, p. 2). This money has been used to provide independent living training for students and their parents as well as for creative housing options, such as supervised apartments and roommate advocate positions, throughout the state. According to one interviewee, testimony before the state legislature by representatives from the parent center, the director of the IOTS, members of the STIC, and others on the lack of

community-based housing options available for individuals with disabilities was crucial to obtaining these state-level funds.

As previously mentioned, State B uses a combination of state and federal funds to implement state-level transition policies. State funds have been used to develop the IOTS (State B Law Number 118-10, 1985), and enhance community living options (State B Law Number 124-18, 1991). In addition, federal funds from the State Systems grant have been used to employ staff persons to further enhance the development and activities conducted by the CTICs across the state.

Information Sharing

Information sharing occurs between and across state and local agencies and individuals in State B. At the state level, the STIC is required to coordinate statewide multi-agency planning activities including resource sharing: "improving the cost-efficiency of existing services, and developing new and alternative cost sharing and resource pooling strategies" (State B State Systems grant, 1991, p.15). Also, one of the goals of the State B interagency agreement, developed and signed by the STIC member agencies, specifically addresses resource and information sharing. In addition to resource sharing activities conducted by the STIC, the IOTS is asked to facilitate leadership activities by providing broad multi-agency training and technical assistance, based on needs generated at the local level.

At the local level, the CTICs are mandated to exchange agency information related to transition and many of the CTICs have developed interagency agreements that parallel the agreement developed by members of the STIC. In addition to sharing information, the CTICs are required to "develop a full array of services needed through a variety of resource pooling, cost sharing, and co-funding strategies between agencies" (State B State Systems grant, 1991, p. 13).

Information is also shared vertically across state and local levels. The IOTS, in conjunction with the STIC, provide training, technical assistance, and information

dissemination to the CTICs and, in return, the CTICs provide local data collection and evaluative information to the IOTS and STIC. In addition, the CTICs provide information regarding the needs, successes, and barriers to implementation at the local level to the IOTS and STIC both of which summarize that information for state policymakers. Multi-level information sharing appears to impact not only the transition-related services, but also the development and implementation of integrated state-level transition policies that bridge service delivery systems.

Past Policy Choices

As previously mentioned, State B has enacted numerous transition-related policies, beginning with initial legislation in 1985. Implementation of past policy choices in State B lead to the creation of a state-level administrative unit for transition (IOTS), the creation of interagency committees at the state (STIC) and local levels (CTICs); and individualized transition planning requirements to be included as part of the IEP process. In addition, State B legislation authorized funding for improved independent living options for individuals with disabilities in 1991 (State B Law Number 124-18). Finally, receipt of the State Systems grant has provided model demonstration site funding to the CTICs and helped initiate and coordinated statewide evaluation efforts.

Policy Instrument Implementation

State B has a history of developing two different types of state-level transition policies. The first type of policy is similar to federal transition-related definition and mandates requiring coordinated individualized transition planning through the IEP process. However, State B mandated individualized transition planning activities three years before they were required by federal legislation. State B special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation legislation used more prescriptive language regarding transition-related activities than those required by federal legislation and extended the age when transition planning is to begin prescribed in federal legislation.

The second type of transition-related legislation passed in State B differs in intent from federal policies. This legislation extends the policies authorized by federal legislation and includes such actions as the development of a new autonomous state-level transition agency and the creation of state and local multi-agency committees. Although federal legislation recommends the development of multi-agency working groups to implement cooperative transition policies and develop solutions to service delivery barriers, State B legislation required the formation of these collaborative relationships. The differences between State B transition policies and federal transition policies may be due, in part, to the fact that State B authorized transition legislation and policy actions before they were included in federal legislation.

The instruments utilized to implement transition-related policies including mandates, inducements, capacity building, and system changing, as well as corresponding evaluation activities are indicated in Table 4 below. In addition to listing the policy instruments and evaluation activities conducted, Table 4 provides information regarding the implementing agencies, policy actions, and expected effects or outcomes associated with each of the instruments. The information provided in Table 4 serves as an organizational tool and guides the following discussion.

Mandates

State B passed legislation that relies on mandates as instruments for implementation beginning in 1987, three years before federal transition mandates were included in the IDEA. The legislation that included transition related mandates, State B Law Number 120.17 of 1987, has two subdivisions that focus on transition. Subdivision 16 mandated the establishment of the STIC and creation of local CTICs. Subdivision 17 mandated transition planning and service provision. Each of these subdivisions are discussed in detail below.

Table 4

Transition-Related Policy Instruments Implemented in State B

Policy Instrument	Implementing Agency	Policy Actions	Expected Effects or Outcomes
Mandates			
State B Law Number 120.17 Subdivision 16 (Mandates the creation of the State Transition Interagency Committee, 1987)	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and others.	(a) Requires establishment of a State Transition Interagency Committee; and (b) Requires establishment of Community Transition Interagency Committees.	(a) Compliance with creation of state-level interagency committees. (b) Compliance with creation of community-level interagency committees.
State B Law Number 120.17 Subdivision 17 (Statewide Transition Legislation, 1987)	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and others.	(a) Requires transition planning; and (b) Requires transition service provision.	Compliance with transition planning and service provision requirements.
Inducements			
Funding authorized by State B Law Number 118.10 (1985)	State Education Agency.	Establishes state-level interagency transition organization.	Creation of the state-level Interagency Office on Transition Services.
Funding authorized by State B Law Number 120.17 (1987)	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and others.	(a) Establishes a statewide interagency agreement; and (b) Serves as a catalyst to state and local systems through cooperative planning.	Development of a transition interagency agreement.

(table continues)

Table 4 (continued)

Policy Instrument	Implementing Agency	Policy Actions	Expected Effects or Outcomes
Funding authorized by State B Law Number 124.18 (1991)	State Education Agency, State Independent Living Agency.	(a) Establishes school-based independent living training programs; and (b) Expand independent living options for adults with disabilities.	(a) Functional training programs implemented. (b) Increased independent living options available.
Funding appropriated within the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant (1991)	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and others.	Develops model transition demonstration sites across localities.	Functional model transition demonstration sites.
Capacity Building			
Employment of Interagency Office on Transition Services Director and staff (State B Law Number 118-10, 1985)	State Education Agency.	(a) Provides statewide training (e.g., workshops, preservice, and inservice); (b) Provides statewide technical assistance (e.g., mail and telephone); and (c) Provides information dissemination (e.g., best practices, pertinent literature).	(a) Upgraded skills of transition service providers. (b) Enhanced transition services and programs. (c) Informed and knowledgeable transition service providers. (d) Increased utility of information for decision making.

(table continues)

Table 4 (continued)

Policy Instrument	Implementing Agency	Policy Actions	Expected Effects or Outcomes
Employment of State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant Director and staff (1991)	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and others.	(a) Enhances statewide training (e.g., workshops, preservice, and inservice); (b) Enhances statewide technical assistance (e.g., mail and telephone); and (c) Enhances information dissemination (e.g., best practices, pertinent literature).	(a) Upgraded skills of transition service providers. (b) Enhanced transition services and programs. (c) Informed and knowledgeable transition service providers. (d) Increased utility of information for decision making.
System Change			
State B Law Number 118.10 designed to alter the structure of state-level systems (Interagency Office on Transition Services, 1985)	State Education Agency.	(a) Creates a new agency to administer transition-related policy implementation and service delivery; and (b) Transfers authority from multiple state-level agencies to a single newly created administrative agency.	Created a new state agency to administer transition-related services.

(table continues)

Table 4 (continued)

Policy Instrument	Implementing Agency	Policy Actions	Expected Effects or Outcomes
State-level Interagency Agreement (1987)	STIC members including State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, IOTS, and others.	(a) Initiates collaborative policy development, implementation, and evaluation; (b) Explores resource and information sharing between agencies; and (c) Creates a state-level model interagency agreement.	(a) Coordinated and integrated transition-related systems. (b) Reduced gaps or delays in services provided to client between agencies. (c) A replicable model interagency agreement to be used by communities to develop local interagency agreements.
Blueprint for state-level systems change (State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant document, 1991)	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and others.	(a) Clarifies interagency roles and responsibilities of state-level agencies; (b) Develops regional and local transition interagency teams; and (c) Assists in guiding interagency planning and collaboration.	Altered arrangement of state-level agencies implementing transition-related policies and services.
Evaluation			
State Transition Interagency Committee (1987) Evaluation	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and others.	Collect needs assessment data to plan and coordinate anticipated service delivery needs.	Evaluation of the current status of transition needs and services that exist in State B.

(table continues)

Table 4 (continued)

Policy Instrument	Implementing Agency	Policy Actions	Expected Effects or Outcomes
Summative evaluation of State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant (1991)	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and others.	Design and implement an evaluation to assess impact of state systems change grant.	(a) Dissemination of final evaluation report. (b) Implement evaluation recommendations. (c) Fulfills grant evaluation requirement.

The STIC and CTICs were created through the same State B legislation passed in 1987 (State B Law Number 120.17, Subd. 16). This legislation requires the STIC to conduct collaborative statewide transition-related planning actions:

> Each agency supports the development of regulations, policies, and practices for the establishment of state agency collaboration to create an equitable statewide system for the provision of community-based transition services. (State B Law Number 120.17, Subd. 16, 1987, p. 3)

The STIC includes representatives from over 10 state agencies.

As previously discussed, the CTICs are mandated to conduct community interagency planning activities that parallel the state-level planning activities conducted by the STIC. The agencies recommended to be involved in CTIC are not designated, but should include representatives from all parties involved or interested in transition. According to the State B State Systems grant:

> Each agency shall support the development of regulations, policies, and practices for local transition interagency committees throughout [State B] communities. These committees will develop, implement, and monitor comprehensive service delivery systems which will respond to the ongoing and changing needs of individuals for service and support. (1991, p. 3)

State B legislation also mandates that information be shared between state and local levels. As previously mentioned, the STIC provides information to CTICs regarding exemplary programs and practices and the CTICs provide evaluative information to the STIC and policy makers. Additionally, the STIC is required to explore links between CTICs working on solutions to similar issues and service delivery barriers.

According to the State B State Systems grant, "In 1987, State B passed the most comprehensive transition legislation in the United States" (1991, p. 6). This state-level initiative included "action to improve individual, community, and statewide transition planning" (State B State Systems grant, 1991, p. 6). This legislation mandated

individualized transition planning for students enrolled in high school (State B Law Number 120.17, Subd. 17, 1987).

The age when individualized transition planning is initiated in State B is more prescriptive than the age requirement included in the IDEA. According State B Law Number 120.17, Subd. 17, transition planning should begin, "By grade 9 or age 14, the plan [IEP] shall address the student's needs for transition from secondary school to post-secondary education and training, employment, and community living" (1987, p. 2). The IDEA requires that transition planning start at age 16, or age 14 when appropriate. In addition, State B Law Number 120.17, Subd. 17 mandates that each IEP "shall address the student's need to develop basic skills to live and work as independently as possible within the community" (p. 2). A provision that is implied, yet not explicitly included in the IDEA.

The broad political goal of mandates, according to McDonnell and Elmore (1987), is compliance with corresponding rules and regulations by service delivery providers. In order to measure the success of implementing mandates, enforcement and monitoring strategies need to be established (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). Although State B passed transition-related mandates in 1987, clearly defined monitoring and enforcement activities have not been established by 1993. The lack of these activities will be discussed in the evaluation section below.

Inducements

Inducements, according to McDonnell and Elmore (1987), include the transfer of funds in return for the production or completion of immediate actions, goods, or services. State B is currently implementing four transition-related inducements. Three of those inducements use funds authorized by the State B legislature, and the fourth uses funds appropriated through the federal State Systems grant. Each of the four inducements are discussed individually below.

Establishment of the IOTS. In 1985, State B legislation authorized funding to create the IOTS (State B Law Number 118.10). The IOTS is designed to provide

leadership across the state. The IOTS is an autonomous transition specific agency, housed in the SEA, that provides state-wide leadership activities including training and technical assistance, receives funding from education and vocational rehabilitation, and administers the federal State Systems grant. Although the IOTS and STIC share many of the same goals, the legislation that created the IOTS is not a mandate, rather, it is an inducement, according to the McDonnell and Elmore (1985) definition provided above.

Dissemination of the state-level interagency agreement. In 1987, approximately $5,000 was authorized by State B Law Number 120.17 to assist the IOTS and members of the STIC to develop and disseminate an interagency agreement focusing on the development, implementation, and evaluation of coordinated transition policies and service provision. The interagency agreement was developed in 1987 and was signed by over ten state-level agencies including the IOTS, special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation. This state-level agreement was also designed to serve as a catalyst for the development of parallel local interagency agreements developed by CTICs. Once completed, the interagency agreement itself became a system changing policy instrument, which will be discussed in that section below.

Establishment of independent living training and options. The third inducement legislated in State B was $500,000 authorized by State B Law Number 124.18 in 1991 to provide students with disabilities training to obtain independent living once they exit high school and to increase the independent living options available to adults with disabilities. These funds, administered through the IOTS, are designed to allow centers for independent living to work with students while they are still in school on obtaining and maintaining independent living options and providing alternative community living options for adults. Centers for independent living received these funds on a competitive basis.

Establishment of state-level model demonstration sites. The fourth and final inducement instrument implemented in State B is availability of funds to each CTIC through the federal State Systems grant. One-time $1000 grants were made available to

localities to initiate CTICs in 1991. In addition, each prescribed CTIC catchment area could apply for an additional $1000 per year, between 1992 and 1995, to conduct a number of open-ended transition related activities including identifying and cataloguing proven transition models, promoting information exchange, developing innovative practices, providing training and technical assistance to local schools and agencies, or conducting evaluation activities.

As previously mentioned, State B uses funds authorized by state-level legislation as well as funds appropriated through the federal State Systems grant to implement a series of transition-related inducements. These inducements are all designed to have immediate impact on the transition-related policy actions and services provided to individuals. In addition, these funds are used to induce both state-level and local-level actions.

Capacity Building

State B has implemented two transition-related capacity building policy instruments both of which focus on hiring state-level transition personnel to conduct various capacity building actions such as the provision of technical assistance. The first capacity building instrument utilizes state-level funds and the second utilizes federal funds from the State Systems grant. Each capacity building instrument is discussed separately below.

The first capacity building policy action implemented in State B is the employment of the IOTS director and staff to increase the capacity of transition-related systems and service providers. Beginning in 1985, State B legislation authorized funding to hire one professional staff person and one administrative assistant to provide training, technical assistance, and information dissemination activities throughout the state (State B Law Number 118.10). Funds for the IOTS come from both education and vocational rehabilitation. The goal of employing the IOTS staff is to increase the capacity of transition service providers by upgrading the skills of transition service providers, assisting with the development of transition programs, enhancing existing programs, and increasing the

utility of information available to transition service providers. The IOTS has been reauthorized by the State B legislation every biennium since 1985.

The second capacity building instrument implemented in State B is the employment of the State Systems grant staff. Part of the federal State Systems grant funds are used to hire two full time professional educational specialists and one administrative assistant. All of these individuals work under the director of the IOTS, who also serves as the director of the State Systems grant. The State Systems grant staff focus their efforts on reviewing and revising the training needs of professionals and paraprofessionals providing transition-related services and designing training programs to meet those identified needs.

Several strategies for addressing preservice and continuing education training needs were outlined in the State Systems grant (1991) including:

> 1. establishing collaboration among [State B] colleges and universities to develop appropriate curricula and opportunities for students participating in preservice and continuing education programs;
>
> 2. revising [State B] licensing and certification standards for special educators, vocational educators, and vocational rehabilitation personnel, and others, to include specific skills and competencies on transition;
>
> 3. including interdisciplinary approaches and strategies in the training of professionals and paraprofessionals;
>
> 4. making available specialized workshops and continuing education programs in regions throughout the state;
>
> 5. developing training and resources and materials that can be used in preservice and continuing education programs; and
>
> 6. seeking consumer input to the design, material development, and delivery of all training. (p. 45)

One interviewee from the major state university stated that a number of inservice training activities had been conducted by the IOTS and State Systems grant staff between 1991 and

1993, including: "seventy summer institutes that bring parents and interagency personnel together for three days of workshops developed around topical issues identified by both parents and professionals" (Interviewee from the State B Major State University, personal communication, July 21, 1993).

The staff of the IOTS and the State Systems grant work together to provide training, technical assistance and information dissemination activities throughout State B. Most of these activities are provided to individual CTICs or groups of CTICs that have similar need or are in the same geographic region. Again, this is an example of how State B commingles state and federal funding to meet identified transition-related needs.

System Change

State B has implemented three system changing transition-related policy instruments designed to alter the authoritative or administrative structures that deliver public goods and services. Those instruments include: (a) creation of the IOTS through state-level legislation; (b) development of a state-level interagency agreement; and (c) development of a blueprint for state-level system changing actions (i.e., State B State Systems grant). Each of these instruments is discussed individually below.

Creation of the IOTS. The creation of the IOTS is the first system change policy instrument implemented in State B. The defining characteristic of a systems changing policy developed by McDonnell and Elmore (1987), "is the transfer of official authority among individuals and agencies" (p. 139). The expected effect the transfer of authority, "is the broadening or narrowing of institutional structure, and may result in the creation of a new class of agency" (p. 139-140). The IOTS, authorized by State B Law Number 118.10 in 1985, is a newly created state-level agency with its own autonomous authority, designed to coordinate transition-related policy implementation and service delivery actions. The creation of the IOTS transferred authority for the provision of transition services from the tradition state-level systems, the SEA and division of vocational rehabilitation, narrowing their influence.

The IOTS also uses state funds appropriated to the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation. This type of cooperative funding is a primary element of system change policies. Therefore, the IOTS meets two of the criteria of system change policy instruments, the transfer of authority between administrative agencies and the use of cooperative funding.

Establishment of a state-level interagency agreement. The second system change policy instrument implemented in State B is a long-standing interagency agreement. Based on work conducted by the STIC in conjunction with the IOTS, State B developed an extensive interagency agreement in 1987 that was signed by over 10 state agency representatives. The State B interagency agreement recognizes that: "effective service delivery will require close collaboration and flexing of policy as we work together on developing and implementation of transition plans" (1987, p. 1). The four broad goals of the State B interagency agreement include:

1. To plan, provide, and fund services;
2. To allocate staff time for statewide coordination of transition planning and programming;
3. To support collaborative planning as we collectively attempt to meet the needs of each individual child;
4. To enter into more specific joint agreements as necessary to achieve the objectives of smooth and effective transition. (1987, p. 1)

The interagency agreement initiated three more specific actions by state-level agencies including: (a) development, implementation, and evaluation of collaborative transition-related policies; (b) exploration of resource sharing; and (c) the creation of a model interagency agreement to be emulated by CTICs. The expected effects of implementing those actions include coordinating transition-related services between pertinent agencies and reducing any delays or gaps in transition services provided to individuals. The actual implementation of these actions and expected effects is still

formative, however, numerous local interagency agreements have been developed by CTICs throughout the state.

State Systems grant provides a blueprint for system change. The third and final system change policy instrument implemented is the State Systems grant document itself. The grant document provides a blueprint focusing on integrating transition service provision. Specifically, the State Systems grant states:

> [State B] supports the development of regulations, policies, and practices for the establishment of state agency collaboration to create an equitable statewide system for the provision of community-based transition services. (1991, p. 3)

The expected effect of implementing this policy instrument designed to integrate transition-related service provision may potentially alter the systems and procedures of providing those services to individuals in need. Collaborative services also implies that the composition of the systems providing transition-related services will be altered. These alterations align with McDonnell and Elmore's (1987) description of system change policy instruments.

Evaluation

State B is currently conducting two evaluations. The first, conducted by the STIC, focuses on identifying the needs of individuals with disabilities involved in the transition process and the status of transition service delivery options to meet those expressed needs. The second evaluation is a summative evaluation of the State Systems grant. Each of these activities is discussed below.

The first evaluation activity undertaken in State B is being conducted by the STIC. According to one interviewee contacted in July of 1993, members of the STIC were beginning to "think through the development of a state funded multi-agency data based evaluation, at least a minimum core of outcomes" (Interview with the State B State Systems grant director, personal communication, July 7, 1993). Although State B has established policies prescribing the creation of state and local interagency committees, individualized

transition planning, and service provision activities to be conducted at both the state and local levels, no systematic evaluation procedures were developed to monitor or assess the implementation of those policies and corresponding services.

The goal of the STIC evaluation is two-fold: first, to identify the expressed transition needs of individuals involved in the transition process; and second, to assess the status of transition service provision. This evaluation is in a formative stage of development, however, it is anticipated that the needs generated from consumers and other interested persons along with information on the status of transition service provision will be used to formatively alter transition service delivery options to better meet the needs of transitioning individuals.

The summative evaluation of the State Systems grant, the second evaluation, is also in a formative stage of development. The goal of this effort is to assess the impact of the State Systems grant on transition-related policy implementation and service provision. According to an interviewee from the major state university, this evaluation will be contracted to a third party, most likely faculty members from the major state university. Additionally, this evaluation will meet the federal evaluation requirement negotiated prior to receipt of the federal grant.

To date, no state-level transition-related evaluation has been completed in State B. However, a number of CTICs have provided unsolicited information to the STIC and IOTS regarding the post-school outcomes attained by former students involved in the transition process. In addition, they have identified barriers regarding transition policy implementation and service provision, and potential solutions to those barriers. This informal exchange of information, according to the director of the IOTS, has been used to shape transition-related policies.

State B Summary

State B is currently implementing varied transition policies that include mandates, inducements, capacity building, and system change instruments. In addition, two

evaluations are currently being undertaken. One of those evaluations is formative in nature, the other is summative, focusing on the impact of the State Systems grant.

It appears that State B relies primarily on inducements, capacity building, and system change policy instruments. State B uses a combination of state and federal funds to induce certain policy actions such as the creation of the IOTS and to develop or enhance the work conducted by CTICs. The IOTS, including staff from the State Systems grant, and the STIC implement a number of capacity building instruments focusing on provision of training, technical assistance, and information dissemination. Finally, State B is implementing a number of system change policy instruments that include the sharing of resources and the creation of a new state-level administrative agency.

State C

Transition-Related Context

State C is located in the New England census region and had approximately 560,000 residents in 1990 (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1993). State C has a small population, one of the few states allocated only one seat in the United States House of Representatives, and is geographically small. Some of the major industries in State C include tourism, computer microchip production, and milk and dairy food production (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1993).

State C does not enact specific state-level special education, vocational education, or vocational rehabilitation legislation. Those systems rely on federal legislation to provide basic policies and corresponding rules and regulations. The only legislated policies enacted by the State C is the appropriation of state-level funding for special education, vocational education, or vocational rehabilitation.

In order to clarify, interpret, or broaden federal policies or provide additional state specific requirements, State C develops supplemental policy documents, entitled "field notes." Field notes are developed by bureaucrats working within the systems and then are approved by the state legislature. Field notes are not developed for each piece of federal

legislation enacted, they are only developed when additional clarification is needed or when State C desires to establish more prescriptive requirements than those required by federal legislation.

Lack of state-level legislation may be due, in part, to the citizenry government operated in State C. State C legislators are only paid a nominal stipend for their services and most maintain full-time employment in the private sector while serving in office (Bryan & McClaughry, 1989). Legislation typically focuses on preserving individual rights and has been described as "hands off," leaving state-level administrative systems tremendous freedom regarding the development of policy implementation and service provision strategies.

In addition to valuing the ideal of a citizenry-based government, local control of education has been guarded and the push towards federal and state-level control has been strongly resisted (Bryan & McClaughry, 1989). Bryan and McClaughry (1989), commenting on the tradition of local school control in State C, write: "If there is any governmental function which ought to be kept close to the people and under the control of their communities, it is the education of their children" (p. 174). Lack of state-level legislation, however, has not deterred development and implementation of many progressive state initiated transition policies.

Bureaucratic Structures

Special education and vocational rehabilitation are the two primary state-level systems involved in transition-related policy implementation and service provision in State C. In 1993, the systems of special education and vocational rehabilitation each had one full-time staff person assigned to implement and coordinate transition policy implementation activities. In addition, the project coordinator for the State Systems grant maintained two offices, one at major state university department of special education and the other within the state division of vocational rehabilitation office complex.

The director of vocational education signed an initial statewide transition interagency agreement developed in 1980. Since that time, however, vocational education has not been actively involved in transition policy implementation. One interviewee from special education noted that past efforts to bring vocational education into the transition arena had not been successful, but current efforts to reestablish connections were being initiated. Vocational education, like special education and vocational rehabilitation, has one staff person assigned the responsibility of implementing special needs policies. However, coordinating transition policy implementation and service delivery is only a small portion of that person's job description which includes other responsibilities such as coordinating policy implementation and services for displaced homemakers, single parents, academically and economically disadvantaged students, and individuals enrolled in non-traditional vocational education programs.

The special education department and University Affiliated Program (UAP), housed at the major state university, have both been key actors in transition policy implementation. A UAP is funded in each state by the federal Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (OSERS) to assist in implementing and informing interested parties about the guiding principles and policies included in the IDEA. According to an interviewee from the state special education system, although faculty from the major state university are not true members of the bureaucracy, they serve as informal consultants assisting with virtually all state-level decisions and strategies related to transition policy implementation and service delivery.

Governmental Capacity

As previously noted, the state-level special education and vocational rehabilitation systems have been the primary transition-related policy implementation bodies since 1980. Most state-level transition-related policy instruments have been administered by those two systems, either individually or in tandem. In addition, the special education department and

UAP at the major state university have been key actors conducting and coordinating numerous transition-related policy implementation and service provision activities.

Special education has funded one full-time professional staff member since 1991 to facilitate the coordination and implementation of transition-related policies. This transition specialist focuses her energy on coordinating transition policies and services between special education and other state-level agencies involved in transition policy development, implementation, and evaluation. In addition, this individual provides telephone, mail, and on-site training and technical assistance to local high schools conducting transition-related activities.

Vocational rehabilitation also employs a state-level transition specialist. This individual works with the transition specialist from special education to coordinate transition-related policies and service provision. In addition, vocational rehabilitation administers seven regional supported employment programs that cover the entire state. These programs work with high school students and adults with disabilities to locate and maintain community-based employment options and have assisted in initiating transition services in various areas of the state.

State C received a State Systems grant in 1991. The mission of this grant is "Implementation of interagency policy initiatives that promote effective transition services and coordinated and efficient utilization of resources across relevant agencies" (State C State Systems grant, 1991, p. 8). This grant funds 5.5 professional positions and most of the staff time is used to provide on-site technical assistance to schools and vocational rehabilitation offices, develop and conduct local, regional, and statewide workshops, and coordinate state-level policy implementation and evaluation activities. An example of a workshop conducted by the State Systems grant staff includes two one-day institutes conducted in the summer of 1993, which were broadcast using an interactive format over public educational television stations throughout the state.

The special education department and the UAP have maintained active roles in transition policy implementation in State C since 1980, although they are not official members of state-level bureaucratic or administrative systems. The special education department and UAP have received numerous federal grants from OSERS focusing on transition, since 1984, including model demonstration project grants, personnel preparation grants, and research grants. Receipt of these grants has indirectly assisted the SEA and vocational rehabilitation through university provided training and technical assistance activities, information dissemination, model project activities, and statewide data collection and evaluation activities. These grants have also influenced state-level transition policy development and implementation. In addition to working with the SEA and vocational rehabilitation, several faculty members of the special education department and UAP have been recognized nationally for their transition research, evaluation, and model demonstration project efforts.

One important federal grant obtained by the special education department at the major state university, in conjunction with the SEA and vocational rehabilitation, was the transition personnel preparation grant received in 1984. Through this and subsequent federal personnel preparation grants, the special education department has enrolled over 70 high school teachers and vocational rehabilitation counselors in masters degree programs emphasizing transition. According to one interviewee from vocational rehabilitation, most of the individuals who have completed this program work at the direct service level within State C. Interestingly, all transition staff persons from the state special education and vocational rehabilitation systems and most of the personnel working on the State Systems grant are graduates of this program.

Technical assistance has been provided to communities by the special education department and UAP and the state-level systems of special education and vocational rehabilitation. The special education department and UAP have been involved in providing technical assistance and training activities in State C since obtaining an OSERS follow-up

follow-along grant in 1984. Through this grant, the special education department and UAP were able to:

> ...develop and implement a state-wide training and technical assistance system to provide on-going support and training to educators, adult services professionals, vocational rehabilitation counselors, employers, students, and families through on-site consultation, workshops, and coursework. (State C OSERS Follow-Up Follow-Along grant, 1984, p. 2)

On-site technical assistance has been provided to all of the high schools that participate in statewide data collection activities.

Faculty members from the special education department at the major state university have been involved in collecting and analyzing student follow-up follow-along data since the early 1980s. Their current follow-up follow-along activity, entitled the Post School Indicator (PSI) project, is based on previous follow-up follow-along efforts. As part of the PSI project, faculty compile transition-related data on individual students collected by schools regarding the post-school outcomes attained by former students enrolled in special education programs, analyze that data, and then provide tailored feedback to participating high schools. Approximately three-fourths of the high schools in State C participate in this program.

PSI data is used for a number of purposes including ongoing research activities at the university, state-level needs assessment information, and federal data reporting and evaluation requirements. Aggregated data and descriptive statistics are developed and provided back to each participating high school in a tailored fashion, comparing results obtained by each school to state averages and also, when possible, comparing results reported from year to year.

Finally, a unique characteristic of the governmental capacity that exists in State C can be described as an informal personal relationship factor. All interviewees contacted stressed the importance of personal relationships between individuals responsible for

implementing transition policies from various state agencies, the special education department and UAP at the major state university, and the coordinator and staff of the State Systems grant. This personal factor allows individuals to formatively develop and implement integrated transition policies that span across service delivery systems.

Fiscal Resources

State C has used both state and federal dollars to support transition policy implementation activities. State dollars have been allocated for transition-related policy implementation activities from the SEA, vocational rehabilitation, and other state agencies. Federal dollars have also been received through successful grants written by individuals and agencies. These state and federal fiscal resources will be discussed below.

Special education and vocational rehabilitation each fund one full-time professional staff member to facilitate the coordination and implementation of transition-related policies. These transition specialists focus their energy on coordinating transition policies and services between special education, vocational rehabilitation, and other state-level agencies involved in transition policy development, implementation, and evaluation. In addition, vocational education funds a special needs coordinator that coordinates transition policy implementation, among other activities.

In addition to funding staff positions, State C has used a combination of state-level resources from a number of state agencies to implement various transition-related policies and service provision activities. One interviewee from the system of vocational rehabilitation described how vocational rehabilitation funds ($20,000) are earmarked specifically for use in schools: "we are still, in 1993, setting aside a certain amount of money each year to fund school programs to help them either initiate supported employment school programs or to expand or enhance the program they already have" (Interviewee from the State C Vocational Rehabilitation system, personal communication, July 1, 1993). In addition, the Department of Employment and Training, in years 1991 to 1993, authorized between $80,000 to $100,000 from the Job Training and Partnership Act

(JTPA) to facilitate the development and ongoing training of employment specialists (i.e., job coaches) working in the regional supported employment offices.

State C has received federal transition-related funding through a number of successful grant competitions, including the State Systems grant received in 1991. These grants have been obtained by the SEA, vocational rehabilitation, and the major state university. Examples include model demonstration project grants, research grants, and personnel preparation grants. Only those federal grants that were connected to state-level policy efforts are discussed below.

As previously mentioned, the special education department at the major state university has been instrumental in transition implementation activities across the state. One example is the masters level transition specialist program initiated in 1984 through receipt of a federal personnel preparation grant submitted by the special education department at the major state university in conjunction with the SEA. As an interviewee from vocational rehabilitation stated:

> The employment transition specialist program has really contributed to cranking out a lot of people into the system that have spread some of the values and philosophical underpinnings that we need for people working in the field around transition and employment to have. (Interviewee from the State C Vocational Rehabilitation system, personal communication, July 1, 1993)

According to that interviewee, graduates from this ongoing training program have touched every corner of the state and have increased the capacity of State C to serve individuals involved in the transition process.

State C received a federal state systems change grant for supported employment in 1986, which provided an initial pool of funding from the federal Rehabilitation Services Agency (RSA) to implement community-based employment options for individuals with disabilities. Part of these funds were used to work with students while they were still in high school and the remainder was used to develop regional supported employment offices.

Twelve LEAs received competitive grants from 1987 to 1992 to develop or enhance model high school supported employment programs.

As previously mentioned, State C received a State Systems grant in 1991. The majority of funds received through this grant are used to hire and maintain 5.5 transition specialist positions. These specialists provide on-site technical assistance to schools and vocational rehabilitation offices. In addition, they develop and conduct local, regional, and statewide workshops, and coordinate state-level policy implementation and evaluation activities.

State C also utilizes funds from numerous sources for transition-related policy implementation and service provision. According to the State Systems grant coordinator, while discussing transition funding in State C, "In [State C] we have got 600 funding sources all being mushed together to come up with programs which make sense" (Interview with the State C State Systems grant director, personal communication, June 4, 1993). Obviously, 600 funding sources is an exaggeration, however, this quotation illustrates the numerous sources that supply fiscal resources for transition-related policy implementation in the state.

Information Sharing

Information sharing occurs through formal and informal networks. Formally, in 1980 the state special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation systems signed an interagency agreement titled "A Statement of Cooperation" designed to:

1. Provide technical assistance and other support to regional and local vocational rehabilitation, special education, vocational education, and guidance personnel to develop, implement, and maintain interagency cooperative agreements;
2. Review regional and local agreements and provide feedback on their quality;
3. Assure that all agreements are consistent with all applicable federal and state laws an regulations pertaining to educational and vocational programs for persons with disabilities; and

4. Assure that individuals affected by those agreements continue to be afforded all rights to due process guaranteed under federal and state law. (State C Statement of Cooperation, 1980, p. 5)

Many regional and local cooperative agreements were written based on this state-level policy action.

In 1992, an interagency Transition Policy Advisory Board was developed after being outlined in the State Systems grant. The Transition Policy Advisory Board includes the commissioners or directors from the state-level systems of vocational rehabilitation, special education, mental health and mental retardation, employment and training (JTPA), social security, private industry council, vocational education, developmental disabilities council, State C parent information and training network, faculty from State C public colleges and universities, and individuals with disabilities. The mission of this board is to facilitate the development and implementation of coordinated transition policies across agencies at the state-level and assist in the development and implementation of regional interagency advisory boards and subsequent interagency agreements.

Regional policy advisory boards are modeled after the state-level Transition Policy Advisory Board. The regional policy advisory boards are designed to coordinate transition service provision and policy implementation at the regional and local levels. Each regional policy advisory board includes representatives from the agencies listed as members of the state Transition Policy Advisory Board as well as other individuals or agencies that provide transition services within each region.

Through the coordinated efforts of the State Systems grant, the special education department and UAP at the major state university, and state special education and vocational rehabilitation systems, a formal state-wide training and technical assistance system was developed in 1992. This coordinated effort was designed to "provide on-going support and training to educators, adult service professionals, vocational rehabilitation counselors, employers, students, and families through on-site consultation, workshops,

and coursework" (State C State Systems grant, 1991, p. 16). Through these efforts, individuals and agencies across the state share information about successful activities and solutions to barriers that exist. The state-wide data collection and dissemination activities, and the masters level program on transition and employment operated by the special education department at the major state university, have spearheaded cross-system training activities in State C.

A week long summer institute designed to bring various state and local transition service providers together has been in operation since 1985. This institute, run on a cost-recovery basis by the special education department at the major state university, is designed to provide both formal training to participants, as well as provide informal time for participants to share information about successful programs and practices. Over three-fourths of the school districts in the state have participated in these workshops.

The PSI project also facilitates information sharing between the major state university, the state-level special education and rehabilitation systems, and local schools throughout State C. Schools are asked to collect data on current and former student enrolled in special education programs and provide qualitative descriptions of the types of transition-related interventions utilized. In return, the special education department at the major state university provides tailored feedback to each participating school regarding the outcomes obtained by former students. In addition, staff from the State Systems grant use the data from the PSI project when developing on-site technical assistance site visits to local schools.

The previously noted personal factor that exists in State C facilitates informal information sharing between and across state and local agencies and individuals. Informal information sharing and dissemination networks have been developed on the basis of personal contacts and relationships that exist between concerned individuals. Additionally, relationships have developed from attendance at summer institutes and on-site technical assistance workshops. These events seemed to have fostered a sense of shared

responsibility regarding the success of all individuals involved in the transition process across State C.

Past Policy Choices

According to the State C State Systems grant, awarded in 1991, "transition has no statutory base in [State C] law" (p. 4). State C utilizes the rules and regulations from the IDEA, the Perkins Act of 1990, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1992, as the legislative basis for transition policy implementation and service provision. However, not enacting state-level legislation has not curtailed the development and implementation of state-level transition policies.

State C has issued a limited number of mandates, such as a prescribed transition planning form and data collection activities. However, State C has traditionally implemented inducements including model projects and hiring transition-specific personnel, capacity building policy instruments such as developing interagency agreements and teams, funding model demonstration projects, and providing training and technical assistance activities across systems, and system changing policy instruments such as interagency agreements and advisory boards.

Policy Instrument Implementation

State C does not enact state-level education or rehabilitation legislation but uses federal legislation as the basis for transition-related policy implementation and service provision activities. The legislature issues field notes to interpret, clarify, broaden, or narrow federal legislation when necessary, however, field notes are not issued for every piece of federal transition-related legislation. State C has utilized a number of transition-related policy instruments, including prescriptive mandates, inducements using state and federal funding, capacity building initiatives, and system change instruments. In addition, State C has maintained long-standing statewide evaluation efforts that focus on collection, analysis, and dissemination of student outcome data.

Table 5 contains a list of the transition-related policy instruments implemented in State C. In addition to listing the policy instruments, Table 5 contains information about implementing agencies, specific policy actions associated with each instrument, andexpected effects or outcomes of implementation. The information provided in Table 5 serves as an organizational tool and guides the following discussion.

Mandates

State C has implemented only one state transition-related mandate. On August 13, 1991 Field Note 91-26 was issued to "provided clarification and a specific summary of the IDEA" (p. 1). This field note included state-level interpretation of the key elements in the IDEA including: (a) providing a definition of transition services; (b) listing the set of activities that comprise transition services and detailing the basis for determining which activities are appropriate for individual students; (c) specifying the process by which a statement of needed transition services are to be included on the IEP; and (d) describing the responsibility of the educational agency to monitor the provision of services.

Field Note 91-26 (1991) also included a required transition planning form to be used at the IEP meeting for students aged 16 years or older. This form must be completed annually and attached to the IEP. The form requires that the IEP team, developed for each student, ensures that appropriate curriculum options be selected by focusing on student and family generated post-school goals. According to Field Note 91-26 (1991):

> Appropriate curricula will include the skills and knowledge necessary for students to make informed decisions in the areas including, but not limited to: (a) employment, career, continuing education and other opportunities for a full, productive life; (b) managing leisure time; (c) managing a household; (d) family living; (e) managing personal finances; (f) caring for personal and medical needs; (g) community access and mobility; (h) interpersonal relationships; (i) responsible citizenship; (j) literacy and communication; and (k) choice-making and self-

Table 5

Transition-Related Policy Instruments Implemented in State C

Policy Instrument	Implementing Agency	Policy Actions	Expected Effects or Outcomes
Mandates			
Field Note 91-26 (State Special Education Policy, 1991)	State Education Agency, Special Education.	(a) Defines transition-related services; (b) Lists activities that comprise transition services; (c) Requires transition planning; (d) Delineates special education's responsibility to plan and monitor transition service provision; and (e) Requires local schools to collect transition-related data.	(a) Compliance with definitions, transition planning actions, and monitoring responsibilities. (b) Compliance with data collection requirements.
Inducements			
Funding ($700,000) for seven regional supported employment offices (1986)	Vocational Rehabilitation., University Affiliated Program at Major State University.	(a) Conducts job development activities; (b) Provides services to help individuals maintain supported employment; and (c) Provides funding to hire vocational rehabilitation counselors and employment training specialists (job coaches).	(a) Functional regional supported employment offices. (b) Employment of vocational rehabilitation counselors and employment training specialists.

(table continues)

Table 5 (continued)

Policy Instrument	Implementing Agency	Policy Actions	Expected Effects or Outcomes
Transition specialist employed by special education (1991)	State Education Agency, Special Education.	(a) Develops coordinated transition policies; (b) Implements integrated transition policies; (c) Coordinates transition services provided between state-level agencies; (d) Provides technical assistance; and (e) Conducts evaluation activities.	(a) Integrated transition policy implementation. (b) integrated transition service provision. (c) Upgraded skills of transition service providers.
Transition specialist employed by vocational rehabilitation (1991)	Vocational Rehabilitation.	(a) Develops coordinated transition policies; (b) Implements integrated transition policies; (c) Coordinates transition services provided between state-level agencies; (d) Provides technical assistance; and (e) Conducts evaluation activities.	(a) Integrated transition policy implementation. (b) integrated transition service provision. (c) Upgraded skills of transition service providers.
Funding appropriated within the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant (1991)	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation.	Recruits and hires 5.5 transition specialists including a project coordinator.	Employment of transition specialists.

(table continues)

Table 5 (continued)

Policy Instrument	Implementing Agency	Policy Actions	Expected Effects or Outcomes
Vocational Rehabilitation funds ($20,000 per year) allocated to local high schools (1991)	Vocational Rehabilitation.	Encourages local schools to develop school-based supported employment options for students.	Increased school-based supported employment options for individual students.
Capacity Building			
Statewide Follow-Up Follow-Along Initiative which became the Post School Indictors (PSI) project (1982)	Special Education Department at the Major State University, University Affiliated Program, State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation.	(a) Collects and analyzes statewide student transition data from throughout state; (b) Provides tailored feedback to local high schools.	(a) Provides local high schools with follow-up follow-along information which can be used for program improvement. (b) Data serves as a needs assessment instrument for local technical assistance. (c) Data is used to help meet state data collection requirement.
Transition Personnel Preparation Initiative (1984)	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, Special Education Department at the Major State University, University Affiliated Program.	Provides preservice and inservice transition-related training to teachers and others involved in transition service provision.	(a) Upgraded skills of transition service providers. (b) Enhanced transition services and programs. (c) Informed and knowledgeable transition service providers. (d) Increased utility of information for decision making.

(table continues)

Table 5 (continued)

Policy Instrument	Implementing Agency	Policy Actions	Expected Effects or Outcomes
Summer Transition Institute run by the Special Education Department at the Major State University (1985)	Special Education Department at the Major State University, University Affiliated Program, State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation.	(a) Provides formal training on topical transition-related issues; (b) Provides an outlet for formal presentations and information dissemination; and (c) Provides an outlet for informal information sharing.	(a) Upgraded skills of transition service providers. (b) Enhanced transition services and programs. (c) Informed and knowledgeable transition service providers. (d) Increased data utility.
Employment of a transition specialist in the state-level special education system (1989)	State Education Agency, Special Education.	(a) Develops transition-related policies; (b) Coordinates transition-related policy implementation actions between agencies; and (b) Provides training and technical assistance to localities.	(a) Integrated transition-related policies. (b) Upgraded skills of transition service providers.
Employment of a transition specialist in the state-level vocational rehabilitation system (1989)	Vocational Rehabilitation.	(a) Develops transition-related policies; (b) Coordinates transition-related policy implementation actions between agencies; and (b) Provides training and technical assistance to localities.	(a) Integrated transition-related policies. (b) Upgraded skills of transition service providers.

(table continues)

Table 5 (continued)

Policy Instrument	Implementing Agency	Policy Actions	Expected Effects or Outcomes
Employment of State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant personnel, 1 project coordinator and 4.5 transition specialists (1991)	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and others.	(a) Provides statewide training (e.g., workshops); (b) Provides statewide technical assistance (e.g., mail and telephone); and (c) Provides information dissemination (e.g., best practices, pertinent literature).	(a) Upgraded skills of transition service providers. (b) Enhanced transition services and programs. (c) Informed transition service providers. (d) Increased utility of information.
Job Training and Partnership Act funds ($80,000) to Regional Supported Employment Offices for ongoing training (1991)	State Department of Employment and Training, Job Training and Partnership Act.	Develops and provides ongoing training for employment specialists (i.e., job coaches).	Increased capacity of employment specialists.
System Change			
Interagency Statement of Cooperation (1980)	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and others.	(a) States the responsibilities of the parties involved; (b) Clarifies the outcomes to be achieved by the agreement; (c) Provides a model for localities; (d) Explores resource and information sharing; (e) Transfers authority between state-level agencies; and (f) Provides a state-level model interagency agreement to be used by local communities.	(a) Coordinated and integrated transition-related systems. (b) Reduced gaps or delays in services provided to clients between agencies (i.e., seamless system of transition services). (c) Creation of a replicable model interagency agreement to be used by local communities.

(table continues)

Table 5 (continued)

Policy Instrument	Implementing Agency	Policy Actions	Expected Effects or Outcomes
Blueprint for state-level systems change (State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant, 1991)	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and others.	(a) Creates Transition Policy Advisory Board; (b) Develops a five year statewide plan for transition services; (c) Clarifies interagency roles and responsibilities of state-level agencies; and (d) Assists in guiding interagency planning and collaboration.	Altered arrangement of state-level agencies in implementing transition-related services.
Transition Policy Advisory Board (1991)	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant personnel, and others.	(a) Provides advice on the integration of transition policies and services; (b) Provides advice on the development of regional transition policy advisory boards; and (c) Explores and develops resource sharing procedures.	(a) Coordinated and integrated state-level transition related policies and services. (b) Coordinated and integrated regional transition-related policies and services.

(table continues)

Table 5 (continued)

Policy Instrument	Implementing Agency	Policy Actions	Expected Effects or Outcomes
Evaluation			
Statewide Follow-Up Follow-Along Initiative later became the Post School Indictor (PSI) project (1982)	Special Education Department at the Major State University, University Affiliated Program, State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation.	Uses federal funds to collect, analyze, and disseminate statewide student follow-up data for program improvement.	(a) Provides local high schools with follow-up follow-along information which can be used for program improvement. (b) Data serves as a needs assessment instrument for local technical assistance. (c) Data is used to help meet state data collection requirement. (d) Improved transition service provision.
Formative and summative evaluation of State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant (1991)	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and others.	(a) Supports the development of a statewide needs assessment; (b) Develops a local follow-up system; and (c) Conducts periodic surveys of LEAs, service providers, students, and parents to assess project impact.	(a) Decisions on project implementation, (i.e., modification, revision, discontinuation). (b) Decisions on planning and development of interventions and strategies, (i.e., modification, revision, discontinuation). (c) Dissemination of final evaluation report. (d) Fulfills grant evaluation requirement.

(table continues)

Table 5 (continued)

Policy Instrument	Implementing Agency	Policy Actions	Expected Effects or Outcomes
Statewide interagency needs assessment summary (1993)	State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant personnel, State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, Special Education Department at the Major State University, and University Affiliated Program.	(a) Develop, collect, and analyze a statewide transition-related needs assessment survey; and (b) Project short-term and long-term statewide transition service provision needs.	(a) Identified short-term statewide service provision needs related to transition. (b) Identified long-term statewide service provision needs related to transition.
Formative evaluation designed to aid program improvement at the local level (1993)	State Education Agency, Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, Special Education Department at the Major State University, University Affiliated Program, and State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant personnel.	(a) Design a system for utilizing follow-up data for the purpose of local program evaluation and improvement; and (b) Implement a system for utilizing follow-up data for the purpose of local program evaluation and improvement.	Improved transition-related services provided at the local level.

advocacy. The school will establish procedures for the on-going review and development of this curricula. (p. 6)

The state-level requirement that the IEP team addresses each of the curricula areas listed above is more prescriptive than the corresponding planning regulation in the IDEA, which requires that the IEP team address three broad areas including: post-secondary education, independent community living, and community participation.

The final transition-related requirement included in Field Note 91-26 (1991) is that local schools collect descriptive data regarding the number of students receiving transition services, the types of services received, and the anticipated number of students who will be entering and exiting the system over the next four years. This information is required by the SEA and vocational rehabilitation to meet federal data reporting requirements and to project future statewide service delivery needs. This data collection activity is not directly related to the PSI evaluation project run by the special education department at the major state university. However, there is overlap in the data required by the state and the data solicited by the PSI project since most schools collect state required and PSI data simultaneously.

At the present time, the systems of vocational education and vocational rehabilitation have not issued field notes that address transition. The federal assurances in the Perkins Act of 1990, and the regulations in the Rehabilitation Act of 1992, are used as the legislative basis for transition policy implementation and service provision. However, these systems may issue field notes in the future when or if necessary.

Inducements

State C has implemented five transition-related inducements using both state and federal resources. These inducements include: funding regional supported employment offices, employing transition specialists in both the special education and vocational rehabilitation systems, funding the employment of transition specialists using money from

the State Systems grant, and funding school-based supported employment options. Each of these inducements are discussed individually below.

Establishment of regional supported employment offices. The first inducement implemented in State C is the state-level funding of seven regional supported employment offices. Since 1986, vocational rehabilitation has spent approximately $700,000 per year to support seven regional offices dedicated to supported employment. These funds are appropriated within the vocational rehabilitation budget and are made up entirely of state dollars and federal matching funds. Each office is operated as a traditional vocational rehabilitation regional office and is staffed by one or two certified counselors who work primarily with clients, including those who have recently exited high school, seeking supported employment.

The vocational rehabilitation counselors working in these offices focus primarily on conducting job development and training activities for clients. Once a job opening has been identified and secured that matches the individual's interests and abilities, an employment specialist (i.e., job coach) is hired for the client. Currently, vocational rehabilitation funds can be used to reimburse the salary of an employment specialist for 20 hours per week for 18 months (Rehabilitation Act of 1992). After that time, it is expected that the client will be able to maintain the job with minimal external support.

Employing a state-level special education transition specialist. The second inducement implemented is the funding of a transition specialist within special education. This position is supported by state-level funds and does not rely on federal grant dollars. The transition specialist is charged with developing and implementing integrated transition policies between special education and other state-level agencies, coordinating the services provided by special education and other systems to reduce gaps or delays in services, providing training and technical assistance to local educational agencies, and conducting state-level transition evaluation efforts.

Employing a state-level vocational education transition specialist. The third inducement is similar to the second. It is the funding of a transition specialist by the vocational rehabilitation system. This individual has the same basic responsibilities as the transition specialist working in special education. Also, the vocational rehabilitation transition specialist is responsible for assisting vocational rehabilitation counselors working with high school students who anticipate needing vocational rehabilitation services immediately after exiting high school. Assisting vocational rehabilitation counselors to work with high school aged students is designed to decrease the likelihood of a gap in services between exiting high school and receiving vocational rehabilitation services.

Employing state-level transition specialists through the State Systems grant. The fourth inducement regards funding that is appropriated within the federal State Systems grant to hire 5.5 state-level transition specialists, including the State Systems grant project coordinator. The project coordinator is responsible for administering all project activities including providing technical assistance and conducting evaluation activities. The project coordinator has two offices in different locations. One office is located in the UAP at the major state university and the second is in the state vocational rehabilitation office complex. This allows the project coordinator to have a presence in two localities and to facilitate communication between the major state university and various state agencies working in the transition arena.

The remaining 4.5 educational specialists are hired to coordinate and provide on-site transition-related training and technical assistance to educators and vocational rehabilitation counselors throughout State C. These activities are conducted in conjunction with the transition specialists from special education and vocational rehabilitation and faculty members from the major state university. In addition, these individuals develop and conduct local, regional, and statewide transition-related workshops, work on coordinating state-level transition-related policy development and implementation activities, and assist with the evaluation of the State Systems grant.

Establishment of school-based supported employment options. The fifth and final inducement implemented in State C is the allocation of vocational rehabilitation funds to develop school-based supported employment options for high school students in need of shoulder-to-shoulder job support. Approximately $20,000 dollars have been available each year since 1991 on a competitive basis to schools that submit a plan to work with regional vocational rehabilitation counselors to develop school-based supported employment options. Between 1991 and 1993, 23 of the 68 public high schools in the state have received funds to develop school-based supported employment programmatic options.

Most of the inducements are in the form of funds earmarked to hire individuals to conduct transition-related policy implementation and service provision activities. These individuals include vocational rehabilitation counselors working in regional supported employment offices, transition specialists working within the state-level systems of special education and vocational rehabilitation, and educational specialists working on the State Systems grant. Although state and federal funds earmarked to hire these individuals is in the form of inducements, a number of the activities that these individuals conduct, such as proving training and technical assistance, are designed to increase the capacity of service providers. These capacity building policy instruments are discussed in the next subsection.

Capacity Building

State C has invested heavily in implementing capacity building policy instruments using state and federal funds. Seven major capacity building instruments can be identified from policy documents and interviews with key stakeholders. These activities include: (a) developing a statewide follow-up follow-along initiative at the major state university; (b) developing a transition personnel preparation initiative at the major state university; (c) providing inservice and preservice training through summer institutes run by the special education department at the major state university; (d) providing technical assistance through special education personnel; (e) providing technical assistance through vocational rehabilitation personnel; (f) providing training and technical assistance through State

Systems grant personnel; and (g) providing funds to support training and technical assistance activities provided to regional supported employment offices. Each of these activities is discussed individually below.

Post School Indicator project. The first capacity building policy instrument implemented in State C is the follow-up follow-along activity that was initiated by special education faculty members from the major state university in 1982. This activity, which grew out of a small federally funded research project, and later became the Post School Indicators (PSI) project, provides tailored feedback to local educational agencies regarding the post-school outcomes obtained by their former students. This information is then used by local schools to identify areas in which they need on-site training or technical assistance. On-site training is then provided by specific experts from the major state university, the special education system, the vocational rehabilitation system, or personnel from the State systems grant. This activity is also part of a statewide evaluation effort and is discussed in the following subsection.

Preservice transition training. The second capacity building policy instrument implemented is the provision of pre service training by the special education department at the major state university. The special education department has obtained several consecutive federal personnel preparation grants focusing on transition since 1984. These grants, designed to provide preservice training to individuals desiring to work in the transition arena, have been used to provide financial assistantships to graduate students and also funding for non-tenured staff members to teach transition-related courses. By the summer of 1993, according to an interviewee from vocational rehabilitation, over 60 individuals had graduated from the transition specialist program, and the majority of those individuals were working as direct service providers.

Summer inservice transition training. The third capacity building policy instrument implemented is the annual summer inservice institute conducted by the special education department and UAP at the major state university, in conjunction with the state-level special

education and vocational rehabilitation systems. The special education department and UAP at the major state university have been conducting these institutes since 1985. These summer institutes include formal presentations on topical transition-related issues, an outlet for formal information dissemination, and also time for informal information sharing among professional working in the field. The institutes are designed to upgrade the skills of transition service providers and increase the utility of information disseminated to them by the university and various other state-level agencies. The university conducts these institutes on a cost-recovery basis, charging participants only the projected amount to cover conference room costs.

Training and technical assistance provided by the special education system. The fourth capacity building policy instrument implemented relates to the training and technical assistance provided by the transition specialist hired by the special education system. Part of this individual's job responsibility is providing training and technical assistance to local educational agencies involved in transition service provision. This training and technical assistance is provided to local educators, students and their parents, vocational rehabilitation counselors, and others involved in transition service provision. Part of this training and technical assistance is planned for specific local educational agencies using data collected from the PSI project.

Training and technical assistance provided by the vocational rehabilitation system. The fifth capacity building policy instrument implemented in State C is similar to the fourth. It is the training and technical assistance provided by the transition specialists hired by the vocational rehabilitation system. This individual focuses her training and technical assistance on upgrading the transition-related skills of vocational rehabilitation counselors throughout the state. In addition, the vocational rehabilitation transition specialist provides training and technical assistance to the regional supported employment offices funded and operated by the state vocational rehabilitation system.

Training and technical assistance provided by the State Systems grant staff. The sixth capacity building policy instrument implemented in State C is the training and technical assistance provided by the State Systems grant staff, with assistance from faculty members from the major state university. A major goal of the State System grant was the: "...implementation of a state-wide system of training to build the capacity of schools and adult service agencies to provide effective transition services to students with disabilities and their families" (1991, p. 8). To this end, State Systems grant staff and faculty from the special education department and UAP at the major state university conduct on-going regional training programs during the academic year. These training programs are topical in nature and are selected based on a needs assessment survey completed by students and their parents, teachers, vocational rehabilitation counselors, and other transition service providers.

Through the State Systems grant, schools receive on-site technical assistance during the academic year. The grant states: "Educators, adult service professional, and families need access to training, technical assistance, and support in order to ensue quality transition services and programs" (1991, p. 4). According to the State System grant coordinator, "During the second quarter of 1993, 15% of grant staff time was spent providing direct inservice [training and technical assistance] and 75 inservices were provided" (Interview with the State C State System grant coordinator, personal communication, July 7, 1993). State C is committed to establishing a technical assistance network around transition.

Funds allocated for regional supported employment office staff development. The seventh and final capacity building policy instrument implemented relates to the approximately $80,000 appropriated through the state-level Job Training and Partnership Act (JTPA) to establish seven regional supported employment offices to provide ongoing training for employment specialists (job coaches). This training is designed to increase the skills of employment specialists and is based on their expressed interests and needs. This

training usually takes place through day-long conferences that rotate between the seven sites.

State C has invested heavily in capacity building policy instruments. Although not discernible from state-level policy documents, many of the training and technical assistance activities are not implemented by individual state agencies or the major state university individually, but are developed and conducted collaboratively. In addition, most of these training opportunities are open to participants from various state and local agencies. According to an interviewee from vocational rehabilitation, "[State C] agencies are very open to working together to provide coherent training and technical assistance to a wide range of service providers" (Interviewee from the State C Vocational Rehabilitation system, personal communication, July 1, 1993).

System Change

There are three system changing policy instruments implemented in State C. The first is the Interagency Statement of Cooperation signed by various state-level agencies in 1980. The second is the blueprint for state-level system change outlined in the State Systems grant. The third system change policy instrument implemented is creation of the Transition Policy Advisory Board, designed to develop and implement transition-related interagency policies and procedures. Each of these policy instruments is discussed below.

State-Level interagency agreement. Seven state-level agencies signed an interagency agreement in State C in 1980, four years before transition was defined in special education literature or cited in federal legislation. This initial system change policy instrument implemented was entitled the "Interagency Statement of Cooperation" and contained two major components. The first component included: "...an explanation of the nature of the cooperative relationship between the parties to the agreement" (State C Interagency Statement of Cooperation, 1980, p. 5). The explanation describes the collaborative nature of distinct state agencies providing services to students and adults with disabilities. The explanation also recognizes the importance of cooperation between

agencies as students and adults move with fluidity between agencies to receive the most appropriate services.

The second major component of the Interagency Statement of Cooperation includes, "...a clear statement of the outcomes to be achieved during the course of the agreement" (1980, p. 5). Although these outcomes were never specified, the State Systems grant coordinator noted that the primary outcome was a successful adult life, which may be different for each individual. In addition, the representatives who signed the initial agreement believed that a model state-level agreement could be used by individuals at the regional or local level to develop similar agreements.

State Systems grant provides a blueprint for system change. The second system change policy instrument is the development of a long-range blueprint for transition-related system change through the State Systems grant. This process, started in 1991 when the grant was awarded, states that individuals and agencies in State C will develop: "...a five year state-wide plan for transition services which includes a mission statement, objectives, activities, and evaluation strategies" (State C State Systems grant, 1991, p. 14). The goal of this plan is to increase the capacity of localities to maintain high levels of transition-related activities after the federal grant has expired. The long-range planning activity is designed to foster the: "...development of organizational and support systems to enable school and adult service professionals, employers, families, and students to develop, maintain, and evaluate effective transition services following the completion of the five year grant" (State C State Systems grant, 1991, p. a).

A system change aspect of this State Systems grant goal involves sharing resources from various sources to implement integrated transition-related policies and services. One funding policy that is utilized in State C is entitled "first-dollar responsibility." According to an interviewee from the state-level special education system:

> First-dollar responsibility refers to the requirement that a given agency serve a defined population using its own resources initially. Other agencies may provide

> services only after the agency with first dollar responsibility has provided and exhausted its services to the target population. (Interviewee from the State C Special Education system, personal communication, July 6, 1993)

This requirement facilitates resource sharing. It forces agencies to fund required services and allows other agencies to supplement those services if necessary.

Establishment of an interagency Transition Policy Advisory Board. The interagency Transition Policy Advisory Board, developed in 1991 as part of the federal State Systems grant, is the third system change policy instrument. The Transition Policy Advisory Board includes representatives from a number of state agencies including individuals with disabilities, parents, employers, and post-secondary education institutions and is designed to integrate the policies and subsequent services provided by those agencies. According to the State Systems grant, the goal of the Transition Policy Advisory Board is the, "Implementation of interagency policies that promote effective transition services and coordinated and efficient utilization of resources across agencies" (1991, p. 8). Policies developed across agencies, that rely on coordination and resource sharing, are system changing in nature, according to McDonnell and Elmore (1987).

According to the State Systems grant, the mission of the Transition Policy Advisory Board is to foster:

> ...interagency collaboration in the design of policies, procedures, and practices that promote a sharing of resources across agencies and a focus on enhancing the satisfaction and post-school outcomes of students and former students with disabilities. (1991, p. a)

Additionally, the Transition Policy Advisory Board seeks to assist in the establishment of regional transition policy advisory boards that focus on coordinating policies and services provided to individuals at the regional and local levels.

A direct result of development of the statewide Transition Policy Advisory Board is the development of regional interagency transition policy advisory boards throughout the

state. The regional boards, according to the State Systems grant, will "...identify local policy and procedural barriers which inhibit successful transition planning and services" (1991, p. 13). Additionally the regional boards are designed to provide evaluative information to the state advisory board, which "...will utilize the information presented by the regional boards to make policy and resource decisions related to transition services" (State C State Systems grant, 1991, p. 9).

The system change policy instruments implemented in State C relate to interagency collaboration and integration. The Interagency Statement of Cooperation developed the initial groundwork for interagency integration in State C, years before this type of action was initiated at the federal level. The State Systems grant and subsequent Transition Policy Advisory Board both focus on the development, implementation, and evaluation of integrated transition policies. Each of these policy instruments rely on resource sharing and system integration for successful implementation.

Evaluation

State C has outlined four evaluation activities focusing on transition. First, the special education department and UAP at the major state university, in conjunction with the state special education and vocational rehabilitation systems are conducting the PSI project and providing technical assistance to participating schools in return. Second, the state special education and vocational rehabilitation systems, through the State Systems grant, are designing an evaluation for determining the effectiveness of the grant objectives and activities in terms of the outcomes achieved by students and former students with disabilities. Third, State C is in the process of initiating a state-wide interagency needs assessment. Fourth, State C is in the process of initiating a formative evaluation strategy designed for the purpose of program improvement at the local level. Each of these evaluation activities is discussed below.

Post School Indicator project. The first state-level evaluation activity is associated with the PSI project conducted by the special education department and UAP at the major

state university in conjunction with the state special education and vocational rehabilitation systems. The PSI project, which grew out of an initial federal model follow-up follow-along grant, includes approximately three-fourths of the sixty-eight high schools in State C. This project has three purposes. First, the data collected by local schools and adult service providers is used by faculty of the major state university in on-going follow-up and follow-along research studies of individuals with disabilities transitioning from school to adult life. Second, the data forwarded to the major state university by local schools and adult service providers is analyzed and a tailored report is sent back to each locality describing the results obtained over time and how those results compare to those obtained in other localities. Third, the data collected by the PSI project has been used by the state department of special education in their annual report of services to OSERS required by the IDEA.

Evaluation of the State Systems grant. The second evaluation activity relates directly to the evaluation of the State Systems grant. The grant states that the project staff will, "Develop and implement an evaluation system for determining the effectiveness of project objectives and activities on the transition related experiences and post-school outcomes of students with disabilities" (State C State Systems grant, 1991, p. 30). According to the State Systems grant coordinator, the development and implementation of this evaluation system will include the most valuable aspects of the PSI project and previous state-level evaluation efforts and that once finalized, this evaluation system will be used by all state-level systems involved in transition service provision.

Interagency needs assessment. The third evaluation effort is still in its incipient stages of development and will ultimately result in an interagency needs assessment summary. The State Systems grant requires that project participants:

> Develop, conduct, and analyze a state-wide interagency needs assessment directed at identifying and assessing all students with disabilities in terms of projected short-term and long-term support needs following graduation or exit from high school. (1991, p. 27)

This needs assessment will assist state-level policymakers and bureaucrats better anticipate the number of students that will need transition services in the future both during and after high school.

Formative evaluation designed for program improvement. The fourth evaluation activity proposed by State C is the implementation of formative evaluation strategies to aid in program improvement at the local level. According to the State Systems grant, the Transition Policy Advisory Board will, "Design and implement a system for utilizing data collected from state-wide follow-up systems for the purpose of program evaluation and improvement related to transition at the local school level" (1991, p. 28). This system, independent of the PSI project, would include local data already collected from various state-level systems to fulfill federal reporting requirements, including special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation, and aggregating that data in a digestible format that could be used by local or regional interagency transition policy advisory boards to improve service delivery.

State C has a history of collecting follow-up data from former special education students. Each of the evaluation activities described above are outgrowths of previous follow-up efforts. Ultimately, key stakeholders intend to implement an integrated evaluation system that meets the evaluation requirements imposed on various state-level agencies. This evaluation system will also serve as a statewide needs assessment projecting the anticipated need for future transition-related services.

State C Summary

Although the State C legislature has not enacted a large number of transition-related mandates, the individuals and agencies involved in transition policy implementation, service provision, and program evaluation have implemented an array of inducements, capacity building, and system change policy instruments. These policy instruments illustrate the willingness of individuals and agencies to collaboratively share transition-related human, material, and financial resources and information. This high degree of

collaboration has been tied to the personal relationships that exist between individuals and agencies involved in the transition arena throughout State C.

It is difficult to quantify or describe the importance of personal relationships in policy implementation activities. However, each of the interviewees from State C expressed an understanding of their agency's role in statewide transition activity and also knew where information could be obtained from other individuals and agencies. This collaborative nature of transition activity was reflected in the number of capacity building and system change policy instruments that were implemented.

Summary

Each of the sample states have implemented a series of policy instruments including mandates, inducements, capacity building, and system change tools. In addition, each of the sample states are conducting formative and summative evaluation activities. The intent of these policy actions is to facilitate the transition made by individuals from school to adult life. However, how that goal is achieved varies from state to state.

The next chapter provides an explanation of the policy instruments implemented across each of the sample states. This discussion also addresses the research questions outlined in Chapter 1. In addition, Chapter 5 discusses issues related to transition policy implementation, the utility of the McDonnell and Elmore (1987) framework as a tool for conducting state-level policy analysis, and recommendations for policymakers and state-level administrators regarding the implementation of transition policies that integrate the systems involved in transition-related service provision.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explain the policy instruments used by a purposive sample of states to implement state-level transition policies. Additionally, this study tested the application of a generic framework for analyzing educational policy implementation developed by McDonnell and Elmore (1987). This chapter summarizes transition-related policy issues that emerged during analysis, discusses conclusions regarding use of the framework as an analysis tool, and provides recommendations designed to foster integrated transition policy implementation.

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section discusses the research questions listed in Chapter 1 and provides a cross-state analysis of the transition-related policy instruments implemented in the sample states. The second section summarizes transition-related policy implementation issues that emerged during analysis, specifically those issues associated with the integration of the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation. The third section discusses conclusions regarding use of the McDonnell and Elmore (1987) framework as an analysis tool applied to state-level transition policy implementation. The fourth section provides recommendations regarding transition-related policies designed to inform policymakers, state-level bureaucrats, program developers, researchers, and administrators from the systems of education and rehabilitation on policy choices available to them, utility of various policy instruments, and conditions that can facilitate or impede implementation.

It is important to note that this study was not evaluative in nature and did not address the efficiency of policy instrument implementation or the post-school outcomes obtained by individuals involved in the transition process within the sample states. Describing the outcomes obtained by individuals enrolled in special education programs, secondary or postsecondary vocational education programs, or vocational rehabilitation programs was not the goal of this study. Rather, this study sought to illuminate the

instruments utilized by states to implement transition policies and subsequent policy actions integrating state-level administrative systems. Therefore, the unit of analysis for this study is state agencies and policy documents rather than local schools, vocational rehabilitation offices, or individuals receiving services. The following discussion relates specifically to state-level policy implementation rather than evaluative outcomes.

Cross-State Analysis

This section compares and contrasts the policy instruments and implementation strategies utilized across the three sample states. The relative distribution of policy instruments and differences between those instruments utilized across sample states are compared and contrasted. In addition, this analysis addresses the research questions listed in Chapter 1. Finally, this analysis provides a broad perspective of cross-state transition policy instrument implementation and extends the utility of the findings to wider audiences and applications.

The cross-state analysis is presented according to the following subsections: (a) mandates, (b) inducements, (c) capacity building, (d) system changing, and (e) evaluation. Policy instruments implemented within each of the three sample states are discussed in each subsection and examples of policy instruments utilized across sample states are provided.

Each of the sample states have implemented a series of transition-related policy instruments including mandates, inducements, capacity building, and system change tools. Although these instruments have unique characteristics and employ different implementation strategies, are all designed to facilitate the transition individual make from school to adult life. It was found that the nature and scope of these policy instruments were quite diverse. In addition, each of the sample states conducted a variety of evaluation activities, including formative and summative evaluations.

Table 6 serves as an organizational tool for the following discussion and provides an overview of the transition-related policy instruments implemented across the sample states. Table 6 also provides a brief description of each of the policy instruments. More

Table 6

Cross-State Comparison of Transition-Related Policy Instruments

Policy Instruments	State A	State B	State C
Mandates			
	Act 294 of 1990 (state special education legislation focusing on transition). Parallels the mandates in the IDEA.	State B Law Number 120.17 Subdivision 16 (1987). Mandates the creation of the State Transition Interagency Committee (STIC).	Field Note 91-26 (1991). State special education policy focusing on transition. Clarifies the mandates included in the IDEA and mandates local data collection.
	Act 969 of 1990 (state vocational education legislation focusing on transition). Parallels the assurances (mandates) in the Perkins Act of 1990.	State B Law Number 120.17 Subdivision 17 (1987). Statewide transition legislation mandates transition planning as part of the IEP process and transition-related service provision.	
	Act 1226 of 1993 (state vocational rehabilitation legislation focusing on transition). Parallels the language (mandates) in the Rehabilitation Act of 1992.		

(table continues)

Table 6 (continued)

Policy Instruments	State A	State B	State C
Inducements			
	Funding authorized by Act 969 of 1990 (state vocational education legislation). Funds used to increase access to vocational education and involve vocational educators in transition planning.	Funding authorized by State B Law Number 118.10 (1985). State education agency funds used to create the Interagency Office on Transition Services (IOTS).	Funding ($700,000) for seven regional supported employment offices (1986). Vocational rehabilitation funds used to create regional supported employment offices.
	Funding appropriated within the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant (1991). Federal grant funds used to employ state-level transition specialists, and fund model demonstration sites.	Funding authorized by State B Law Number 120.17 (1987). State funds used to establish a statewide interagency agreement which is also a model for localities to emulate.	Transition specialist employed by special education (1991). Special education funds used to employ a state-level transition specialist.
		Funding authorized by State B Law Number 124.18 (1991). State education agency and state independent living agency funds used to establish school-based independent living training programs and expands independent living options.	Transition specialist employed by vocational rehabilitation (1991). Vocational rehabilitation funds used to employ a state-level transition specialist.

(table continues)

Table 6 (continued)

Policy Instruments	State A	State B	State C
		Funding appropriated within the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant (1991). Federal grant funds used to create model demonstration sites.	Funding appropriated within the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant (1991). Federal grant funds used to hire 5.5 transition specialists.
			Vocational Rehabilitation funds ($20,000 per year) allocated to local high schools (1991). Funds used to create school-based supported employment programs.
Capacity Building			
	Employment of six qualified regional transition specialists through the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant (1991). Provides a mechanism for statewide training, assistance, and information dissemination.	Employment of Interagency Office on Transition Services Director and staff (1985). Provides a mechanism for statewide training, technical assistance, and information dissemination.	Statewide Follow-Along Initiative, later the Post School Indictors (PSI) project (1982). Provides a mechanism for collecting and disseminating student outcome data for needs assessment information and program improvement.

(table continues)

Table 6 (continued)

Policy Instruments	State A	State B	State C
		Employment of State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant director and staff (1991). Provides an additional mechanism for statewide training, technical assistance, and information dissemination.	Transition Personnel Preparation Initiative (1984). Federal grant funded program that provides preservice and inservice training to graduate students focusing on transition. Summer Transition Institute run by the Special Education Department at the Major State University (1985). Summer institutes run by the special education department at the major state university designed for information sharing and dissemination. Employment of a transition specialist in the state-level special education system (1989). Provides a mechanism for statewide training, technical assistance, and information dissemination.

(table continues)

Table 6 (continued)

Policy Instruments	State A	State B	State C
			Employment of a transition specialist in the state-level vocational rehabilitation system (1989). Provides a mechanism for statewide training, technical assistance, and information dissemination. Employment of State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant personnel, 1 project coordinator and 4.5 transition specialists (1991). Provides a mechanism for statewide training, technical assistance, and information dissemination. Job Training and Partnership Act funds ($80,000) to Regional Supported Employment Offices for ongoing training (1991). Provides a mechanism for training, technical assistance, and information dissemination provided to regional supported employment office vocational rehabilitation counselors.

(table continues)

Table 6 (continued)

Policy Instruments	State A	State B	State C
System Change			
	Establishment of the Governor's Interagency Council on Self Sufficiency (1989). Creates an interagency council designed to develop, implement, and evaluate integrated transition-related policies.	State B Law Number 118.10 designed to alter the structure of state-level systems (Interagency Office on Transition Services, 1985). Creates a new agency to administer state-level transition policy implementation.	Interagency Statement of Cooperation (1980). Creates a state-level model agreement, discusses resource sharing, and transfer of authority among state agencies.
	State-level Interagency Agreement (Governor's Interagency Council on Self Sufficiency, 1991). Creates a state-level model agreement, discusses resource sharing, and transfer of authority among state agencies.	State-level Interagency Agreement (1987). Creates a state-level model agreement, discusses resource sharing, and transfer of authority among state agencies.	Blueprint for state-level systems change (State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant document, 1991). Clarifies roles of state-level agencies, and develops regional and local interagency teams.
	Blueprint for state-level systems change (State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant document, 1991). Clarifies roles of state-level agencies, develops regional and local interagency teams, and guides interagency collaboration.	Blueprint for state-level systems change (State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant document, 1991). Clarifies roles of state-level agencies, develops regional and local interagency teams, and guides interagency collaboration.	Transition Policy Advisory Board (1991). Creates an interagency board designed to develop, implement, and evaluate integrated transition-related policies.

(table continues)

Table 6 (continued)

Policy Instruments	State A	State B	State C
	Legislation altering the composition of state-level systems (Act 574 of 1993). Transfers administration of state vocational rehabilitation system to state vocational education system director.		
Evaluation			
	Formative and summative evaluation of state-level policy implementation and outcomes (Governor's Interagency Council on Self Sufficiency 1989). Evaluation of statewide transition-related policy implementation and service provision.	State Transition Interagency Committee evaluation (1987). Collects needs assessment data to plan and coordinate anticipated transition-related service delivery needs.	Statewide Follow-Up Follow-Along Initiative later became the Post School Indictor (PSI) project (1982). Federal and state funds used to collect, analyze, and disseminate statewide student follow-up data for program improvement.
	Formative and summative evaluation of State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant (1991). Evaluation of the impact of the State Systems grant.	Summative evaluation of State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant (1991). Evaluation of the impact of the State Systems grant.	Formative and summative evaluation of State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant (1991). Evaluation of the impact of the State Systems grant.

(table continues)

Table 6 (continued)

Policy Instruments	State A	State B	State C
			Statewide interagency needs assessment summary (1993). Develop, collect, and analyze a statewide needs assessment survey to project service provision needs. Formative evaluation designed to aid program improvement at the local level (1993). Develop a system for making better use of follow-up follow-along data by localities.

detailed descriptions are included for each sample state in Tables 3, 4, and 5, respectively, located in Chapter 4.

Mandates

The first research question is: How are states implementing transition-related mandates? State-level transition-related mandates generally parallel federal legislation. The IDEA, the Perkins Act of 1990, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1992, each contain a number of requirements and assurances, such as requiring the inclusion of transition-related objectives on the IEP, determining how specific objectives should be determined for individual students, outlining the responsibility of the educational system to monitor the provision of transition related services, assuring individuals with disabilities equitable access to vocational education, assuring that vocational educators be involved in transition planning when appropriate, and describing how vocational rehabilitation counselors will be involved in transition planning. In addition to implementing similar mandates, each of the sample states have enacted their own transition-related mandates.

It is noted that all three states have implemented mandates that parallel federal legislation. Interestingly, State B passed transition-related legislative mandates prior to enactment of the federal legislation. States A and C enacted state-level mandates after federal policy initiatives became law. These state-level mandates are discussed below.

State A implemented three transition-related mandates. Each of these mandates was enacted after federal transition-related legislation was enacted that directs the actions of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation systems, respectively. These mandates mimic the definitions, language, assurances, and service provision requirements included in the respective federal legislation and do not contain any additional or more prescriptive state-level requirements.

State B enacted transition-related mandates in 1987, three years prior to their inclusion in federal legislation. The State B transition-related mandates are generic in nature and focus on all transition service providers including special education, vocational

education, and vocational rehabilitation, rather than a single state-level system. In addition, the State B transition-related mandates are more prescriptive than those contained in the federal legislation. For example, State B requires that transition planning begin when a student is 14 years old or enters ninth grade, whereas the IDEA requires that transition planning begin at age 16 and annually thereafter and only suggests that transition planning begin at age 14.

In addition to specifying transition-related service provision requirements, State B has a mandate, State B Law Number 120.17, Subd. 17 (1987), that requires the creation of a statewide interagency committee, the State Transition Interagency Committee (STIC). The STIC includes members from a number of state-level agencies and acts as an advisory board to transition-related policy development, implementation, and evaluation. This mandate is unique and is not replicated in either State A or C.

State C issues field notes to clarify or add to federal legislation when necessary. The only transition-related field note issued in State C is Field Note 91-26 (1991), issued after the IDEA was enacted. This field note clarifies the transition-related definitions and requirements included in the IDEA, includes a list of curricular areas that should be addressed during transition planning, and specifies a required transition planning form to be used at the IEP meetings for all students age 16 years or older. This required transition planning form is then used as part of statewide data collection and evaluation effort. State C has not issued field notes clarifying the transition-related assurances and language included in the Perkins Act of 1990 or the Rehabilitation Act of 1992.

All three sample states require that transition planning begin by the time a student reaches his or her sixteenth birthday, or ninth grade, whichever occurs first (State B requires that transition planning begin when a student reaches age 14). All three sample states expect that vocational education and vocational rehabilitation, along with special education, will be involved in transition planning and service provision. In addition, all three of the states use the mandates included in federal legislation to provide the basic

framework for transition planning and service provision activities. Even State B legislation, which was enacted prior to federal transition mandates, addresses the same components as corresponding federal legislation.

In summary, each of the sample states have enacted transition-related mandates that contain common elements. State A enacted mandates that parallel those included in federal legislative initiatives. State B enacted broad transition-related mandates before they were addressed in federal legislative initiatives. State C issued a field note clarifying the transition-related components included in the IDEA. Although each of the transition-related mandates described above contain slightly different elements, they are all relatively similar.

Inducements

The second research question is: How are states implementing transition-related inducements? A combination of state and federal funds were used to implement transition-related inducements in all three sample states. Each state used federal funds, including funds from the State Systems grant, to implement inducements such as establishment of model demonstration sites or hiring personnel. The amount of state-level funds used to implement transition-related inducements varied widely between sample states.

State A used federal funds from the State Systems grant to fund three transition related inducements: (a) to employ transition specialists; (b) to fund model demonstration sites; and (c) to establish local transition planning teams. In addition to using federal funds, the State A legislature authorized approximately $1,000,000 of state-level vocational education funds per year beginning in 1990 to implement the special needs assurances included in the Perkins Act of 1990. However, it was unclear how much of that money is used specifically for transition-related policy implementation and service provision activities. In addition, all interviewees from State A expressed concern over the lack of state-level funds available for transition-related actions.

State B implemented four transition related inducements, three of which rely on state-level funds, including: (a) funding used to create and maintain the Interagency Office

on Transition Services (IOTS); (b) funding used to establish and disseminate a statewide interagency agreement; and (c) funding used to establish school-based independent living training programs and expand independent living options throughout the state. Each of these inducements were initiated by legislation and are not required by federal legislation. State B has maintained the IOTS, a separate governmental administrative agency focusing on transition policy development and implementation, training and technical assistance, and evaluation, since 1985.

In addition to inducements funded by state-level appropriations, State B also uses a small portion of the federal funds obtained through the State Systems grant as inducements. These funds are used to hire state-level transition specialists and to establish model demonstration sites. The director of the IOTS also serves as director of the State Systems grant and supervises grant personnel.

State C implemented five transition-related inducements, four of which use state-level funds, including: (a) establishing seven regional supported employment offices; (b) hiring transition specialists to work in the state-level special education system; (c) hiring a transition specialist to work in the state-level vocational rehabilitation system; and (d) establishing school-based supported employment programs. The fifth inducement, hiring 5.5 transition specialists, uses federal funds obtained through the State Systems grant. The majority of transition-related inducements in State C are used to hire transition personnel.

In comparison, States A and B both implement inducements that focus on program development and enhancement. State C implements inducements that focus on hiring state-level transition personnel. In addition, funds allocated to hire transition-specific personnel in State C are not time limited and will continue longer than the time limited funds allocated by the legislative bodies in States A and B or the State Systems grant.

Capacity Building

The third research question is: How are states implementing transition-related capacity building policy instruments? All three sample states are implementing an array of

capacity building policy tools including developing interagency transition groups, funding model demonstration sites, and providing training and technical assistance. The sample states use a combination of state and federal funds in order to implement these activities.

State A has employed six regional transition specialists to provide training, technical assistance, and information dissemination to local service providers using funds from the federal State Systems grant. As of 1993, State A had no plans to maintain those six positions with state-level funding once the State System grant expires. Therefore, it appears that State A is relying solely on federal funds to implement capacity building policy instruments.

State B uses a combination of state and federal funds to implement two capacity building policy instruments. First, state-level funds are used to maintain the IOTS. As previously mentioned, the IOTS is a separate state-level agency that provides training, technical assistance and information dissemination, among other activities, to service providers throughout the state.

The second capacity building policy instrument implemented in State B is the employment of the State Systems grant staff. These individuals focus on providing training, technical assistance, and information dissemination to service providers, particularly the model demonstration sites, throughout the state. The IOTS and State Systems grant staff work together to provide these capacity building activities.

State C also used a combination of state and federal funds to implement a series of capacity building policy instruments. In addition to hiring state-level personnel and State Systems grant staff, the state has engaged faculty from the major state university to assist with implementing capacity building actions centered around the provision of training, technical assistance, information dissemination, and local data collection and utilization. State C has invested heavily in capacity building policy implementation and attacks capacity building from a number of state-level fronts including the systems involved in administering transition policy implementation.

All three sample states have developed state-level transition interagency groups. In two of the sample states, States B and C, these groups were developed prior to receiving the federal State Systems grant. In State A, the state-level interagency group was developed after receipt of the State Systems grant.

These interagency groups focus on facilitating transition policy implementation, and identifying barriers to implementation, transition service delivery, and transition evaluation activities. In all of the sample states, designees from special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation are key members, along with representatives from other state agencies, individuals with disabilities, parents, employers, and the coordinator of the federal grant.

Another capacity building tool common to two of the sample states was establishing state-level model demonstration projects. State B used both state and federal funding from the State Systems grant to fund model demonstration projects and State A relied solely on federal funds. These model demonstration sites were funded on a competitive basis and are required to: (a) disseminate information about their innovative or successful activities; (b) provide some type of technical assistance to other localities either through site visits or presentations at state-level conferences; and (c) collect follow-up and follow-along data on the outcomes attained by students and former students as they move from school to adult life.

Providing training and technical assistance was another capacity building activity implemented by all of the sample states. State A used personnel employed by the State Systems grant to conduct training activities on an on-going basis through regional offices that encompass the state. State B used a combination of federal and state funds to conduct regional and state-wide training activities. State C also used a combination of federal and state funds to provide training and technical assistance activities. Additionally, the major state universities in State B and C were involved in providing graduate-level preservice and

state-wide inservice training to individuals and agencies involved in transition service provision.

System Change

The fourth research question is: How are states implementing transition-related system change policy instruments? A series of system change policy instruments have been implemented by each of the sample states. Broadly, these policy instruments have been used to: (a) create a state-level interagency organization or policy advisory board; (b) develop a state-level interagency agreement; (c) utilize the State Systems grant document as a blueprint for systems change; (d) shift authority of state-level administrative agencies; and (e) create a new state-level transition-specific administrative agency or organization.

State A implemented four system change policy instruments including: (a) creation of a state-level interagency organization or policy advisory board; (b) development of a state-level interagency agreement; (c) utilization of the State Systems grant document as a blueprint for systems change; and (d) shifting authority of state-level administrative agencies. Noteworthy is the shift in authority of the state-level vocational rehabilitation system to the vocational education system. This shift is a classic example of system change according to McDonnell and Elmore (1987). The other system change instruments provide a framework for resource sharing and service provision collaboration between state agencies and other interested individuals and organizations.

State B implemented three system change policy instruments including: (a) creation of a new state-level transition-specific administrative agency; (b) development of a state-level interagency agreement; and (c) utilization of the State Systems grant document as a blueprint for systems change. A separate agency within the SEA special education section, the IOTS, has been created to coordinate transition-related policy development, implementation, and evaluation activities, including providing training, technical assistance and information dissemination. The director of the IOTS also administers the federal State

Systems grant. Both the IOTS and the state-level interagency agreement were developed prior to enactment of federal transition-related legislation.

State C also implemented three transition-related system change policy instruments including: (a) development of a state-level interagency agreement; (b) utilization of the State Systems grant document as a blueprint for systems change; and (c) creation of a state-level interagency organization or policy advisory board. All of the policy instruments implemented stress resource sharing in order to facilitate transition-related policy implementation and service provision. Additionally, the personal relationships developed between state-level agencies and organizations blurs the bureaucratic lines that can deter resource sharing.

The system change policy instruments implemented by the sample states focus on resource sharing and collaborative service provision. These actions require that state-level administrative units be willing to broaden or narrow their authority when necessary. Without this willingness, the transition of individuals from school to adult life, the ultimately goal of these policy actions, may be subverted or delayed.

Evaluation

The fifth and final research question asks: How are states evaluating the implementation of transition policies? All of the sample states were evaluating the effectiveness of their transition policies. States are conducting formative evaluation activities designed to provide policy makers information about the success of various policy implementation activities or barriers that may impede the implementation of policies. Additionally, all of the sample states are conducting some form of student follow-along evaluation activity. This activity was summative in nature.

State A has implemented two evaluation activities. The first is a broad evaluation of statewide transition-related policy implementation and service provision activities conducted by the state-level interagency organization. The second is a formative and summative

evaluation of the impact of the State Systems grant. Unfortunately, neither of these evaluations were completed prior to the data collection phase of this study.

State B is also conducting two state-level transition evaluation activities. The first is a needs assessment designed to project statewide transition-related service delivery needs. The second is a summative evaluation of the impact of the State Systems grant. State B has not implemented any mechanism for formatively evaluating state-level transition policy implementation or the progress of the State Systems grant.

State C is conducting, or planning to conduct, four transition-related evaluation activities. Those activities include: (a) a statewide follow-up follow-along evaluation of student outcomes; (b) formative and summative evaluation of the impact of the State Systems grant; (c) a statewide interagency needs assessment; and (d) a formative evaluation designed to increase the utility of the follow-up follow-along data collected by localities throughout the state. It should be noted that State C has a history of collecting student follow-up data for program improvement purposes.

All of the sample states are implementing both formative and summative evaluation activities. The formative evaluation activities observed in all three sample state focused on the success of transition policy implementation activities and identifying any barriers that impeded policy implementation or service delivery. In State A, formative evaluation efforts were not conducted prior to receiving the federal grant, however, in States B and C, formative evaluation activities had been conducted since the mid 1980s.

The summative evaluation efforts implemented in the three sample states were designed to examine the impact of the State Systems grant or follow-up follow-along studies describing the outcomes attained by former students. The follow-up data was collected by faculty from the major state universities in States A and C, and was used by both the state education and vocational rehabilitation systems. This data was also used as part of long-term research project conducted by faculty from those institutions. Additionally, data collected by all of the sample states were used as part of the data

collection requirements for special education programs outlined by Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) in the IDEA.

Cross-State Analysis Summary

Each of the three sample states have implemented a variety of transition-related policy instruments. All three sample states implement transition related mandates, inducements, capacity building, and system change policy instruments as well as evaluation activities. Although the states each selected different instruments to implement transition-related policies, the basic goal of each of these policies is similar and are designed to assist individuals make the transition from school to adult life.

Variance exists within and between the specific policy instruments and implementation strategies selected by each of the sample states. The immediate goals, agencies, and actors implementing each of the policy instruments varies between sample states. In addition, the emphasis placed on evaluation activities also differs between states. These differences and variations may be a function of a number of factors including the transition-related context that exists in each state, the state-level administrative and bureaucratic layers that exist, and the willingness of key stakeholders to share resources and decision making regarding the provision of transition-related services.

The unique transition-related context that exists in each of the states often dictates the policy instruments selected for implementation. As previously mentioned, the basic goal of transition policy implementation is to facilitate the successful movement of individuals with disabilities from school to adult life. However, the policies designed and implemented to achieve this goal vary depending on contextual characteristics including bureaucratic structures that exist, governmental capacity, fiscal resources, information sharing, and past policy choices.

The layers of bureaucracy that exist in each individual state also appears to affect the policy instruments selected for implementation. The larger the number of layers, the more likely prescriptive policies will be implemented. In states where state-level administrators

from different agencies know each other, the more informal policy implementation occurs. Personal relationships affect the types of policy instruments selected and implemented.

Personal relationships between key stakeholders also influence the amount of resource and information sharing that occurs within a given state. Information and resource sharing, in turn, affects the policy instruments implemented. States that have well established information and resource sharing mechanisms tend to rely on capacity building and system changing policies whereas states without these mechanisms tend to rely on more prescriptive policies such as mandates.

The next section summarizes the major findings associated with transition-related policy implementation that emerged from the results of this study. This analysis uses information included in the cross-state analysis as examples of the findings discussed.

Findings

Ten major findings associated with transition policy implementation emerged from the results of this study including: (a) varying levels of state agency involved in transition policy implementation; (b) little emphasis on evaluation of policy implementation; (c) use of different instruments to achieve the same policy goals; (d) reliance on federal funds to implement transition policies; (e) turf issues; (f) competing initiatives; (g) lack of state-level resources; (h) the personal factor; (i) student-centered evaluation activities; (j) state-level politics. These findings are discussed separately below.

Varying State Agency Involvement

In each of the sample states, different agencies and individuals were involved in implementing transition-related policies. The state-level systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation, are required by federal legislation to be involved in transition policy implementation and coordinating service provision. However, the extent of each agency's involvement varies from state to state. In each of the sample states, a single agency appeared to take the lead regarding transition policy implementation. This agency coordinated transition activity, had tremendous influence at the state-level

regarding policy development and implementation strategies, and was deferred to by other agencies and individuals as the lead state-level transition agency.

The lead agency in each of the sample states appeared to have the most developed system for accessing current transition-related information from a wide array of sources, including OSERS, the National Transition Network (NTN), or the Transition Research Institute (TRI), and then disseminating that information to regional or local service providers and consumers. In each of the sample states, the lead agency was information rich, and appeared to exert the most influence on state-level transition-related decision making.

Special education or vocational rehabilitation appeared most often to be the lead state agency involved in transition policy implementation. The state-level special education and vocational rehabilitation agencies were required to co-write the federal State Systems grant and, in the sample states, those grants have been a springboard to transition-related policy activities. However, there were other key players identified in each sample state including, but not limited to vocational education, state universities, and parent organizations.

Vocational education was included as a key player in the federal State Systems grants submitted by each of the three sample states. Additionally, a representative from vocational education is a member of each sample state's transition policy advisory board. However, the system of vocational education does not appear to be as actively involved in state-level transition policy implementation as special education and vocational rehabilitation.

Vocational education does not appear to be involved in transition service provision at the local-level, even though vocational educators are required by the Perkins Act of 1990 to assist in transition planning activities for individual students as prescribed in the IDEA. Vocational education's less active role in transition policy actions may be due, in part, to its global mission of providing school to work options for all of the students rather than

focusing specifically on individuals with disabilities. Additionally, vocational education was not required to be included in writing the federal State Systems grant, which is a key state-level transition policy document in each of the sample states.

The major state university in each of the sample states appeared to have tremendous influence on state-level transition policy implementation. Faculty members from the major state university in each sample state were involved in providing transition-related inservice and preservice training to service providers and consumers. Faculty were also key members of state-level transition policy advisory boards, were conducting or involved in state-level transition evaluation actions, and were looked to as experts for information and advice on a wide range of transition-related topics and issues. It appears that linkages between faculty members at the major state university and state-level administrators have a beneficial effect on statewide transition policy implementation activities.

Parent and consumer groups played key roles in transition policy implementation in two of the three sample states. In one sample state, parent pressure was viewed as the catalyst to initial transition activity prior to the passage of the and IDEA and the Perkins Act of 1990. Parent and consumer groups are included as members of the state transition advisory board in each sample state and are viewed as strong advocacy groups in each of the sample states.

All of the actors mentioned above influence state-level transition policy implementation. The problem is to measure how the personal relationships between these actors influence state-level policy actions. If the relationships between key stakeholders are positive, those collegial relationships may appear in state-level policy actions. This appeared to be the case in each of the sample states observed during this study. However, adversarial relationships could negatively impact transition-related policy instrument implementation in other states.

Limited Implementation Evaluation

The IDEA requires that states conduct evaluation activities that focus on student outcomes rather than on the success or failure of state-level policy implementation actions. Therefore, all of the sample states are developing and implementing evaluation strategies that address school and post-school services provided to individuals involved in the transition process and the outcomes those individuals attain once they exit the educational arena and enter adult life. However, it appears that the sample states have given little attention toward understanding the issues and barriers surrounding transition policy implementation.

McDonnell and Elmore (1987) identify barriers that can impede implementation of each of the policy instruements. For example, barriers to implementing mandates include: setting minimum standards for compliance creates disincentives to exceed those standards; introducing coercive or adversarial relationships between the enforcement agency and the object of enforcement (i.e., state agencies monitoring implementation actions and services provided by local agencies); creating an enforcement mechanism; and developing appropriate penalties or remedies for noncompliance. It does not appear that these barriers appear to exist in state-level transition-related evaluation efforts.

State-level evaluation actions focusing on policy implementation could discern which policy tools (i.e., mandates, inducements, capacity building instruments, and system change instruments), would be best suited for each policy action. State agencies could conduct both student-centered and policy implementation activities, possibly together, to better inform policymakers, bureaucrats, program developers, educational administrators, teachers, parents, and consumers about the outcomes attained by students and former students involved in the transition process about why policy instruments were chosen for implementation.

Varying Implementation Strategies

It appears that different states are using different policy instruments to achieve the same policy goals. For example, States B implemented a mandate requiring that transition planning be included on the IEP for all students beginning in the academic year in which they turn fourteen years of age or enter ninth grade, whichever comes first. State C has the same policy goal. However, State C, which did not enact state-level legislative mandates, implemented capacity building tools in the form of state-wide training to achieve the same policy goal, facilitating transition planning for individual students beginning in the academic year when they reach age fourteen. These differences may reflect the context, including the transition-related policy context, that exists in each of the states.

The use of different policy instruments by different states to achieve similar goals appears to be primarily associated with past policy choices, one of the defining characteristics of the transition-related policy context that exists in each state. If a state traditionally implements mandates, it most likely will continue to choose mandates to implement new policy initiatives. Similarly, if a state has implemented a series of capacity building instruments, it is likely to continue to implement capacity building instruments to implement new policy initiatives.

This may be due, in part, to the institutionalization of implementation and monitoring strategies by state agencies. Once state-level implementation and monitoring strategies are established and operational, those strategies take on an inertia and are accessed to expedite future implementation and subsequent evaluation efforts. States do not appear to make radical shifts in policy implementation choices, and if shifts are made by implementing different policy instruments, they are made cautiously and over an extended period of time.

The implementation instruments selected by the sample states appear associated with past policy actions. For example, if a state had a well established system of providing training and technical assistance, it tends to access those systems by enacting capacity

building policy instruments which include training and technical assistance components. Therefore, internal implementation systems established in each state influence future policy implementation instrument choices and strategies.

Reliance on Federal Funding

All of the sample states rely heavily on federal funds to implement transition-related policies. The funds obtained through receipt of the federal State Systems grant are used as a primary catalyst for implementing many state-level transition policies. Federal funds appeared to drive policy actions within the sample states and provide a basis for developing interagency transition policy advisory boards and integrated policy actions.

There are a number of positive and negative factors associated with reliance on federal funds to implement lasting state-level policies. The pros are varied and often overlooked. First, federal funds allow states flexibility to experiment with transition policy actions that otherwise would most likely not have been enacted. The receipt of federal dollars provides not only tangible funding to initiate transition policy action but becomes a rallying point for transition at the state-level and increased the sense of immediacy surrounding policy implementation and service delivery. It appeared that once states received the federal State Systems grant, a cry of "the time is now" could be heard from policy makers and bureaucratic administrators involved in the transition arena to take action.

Second, the federal State Systems grant requires state agencies, that traditionally have not worked in a coordinated manner, to begin developing policies that would mesh their systems at the state and local levels. Although the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation remain primarily autonomous within the sample states, they have begun to implement system change policies, opened lines of communication, and facilitated a sense of shared responsibility regarding transition policy implementation and service provision. It is doubtful that these actions would have occurred without the influx of federal grant funds.

The most obvious negative associated with reliance on federal funding can be stated in two connected empirical questions. The first is what happens to the state-level initiatives, such as the employment of state transition personnel and the development of transition policy advisory boards, once the federal grant expires? The second question is will the federally supported systems involved in transition policy implementation be able to maintain and build upon those actions to provide increasingly better options for individuals, or will those initiatives collapse when the grant expires?

The answers to these questions are difficult to predict. However, using the approximately 260 expired OSERS funded model demonstration projects in transition in an analogous manner, it appears that some of the salient characteristics of projects do become institutionalized and remain in some form after the initiating federal grant expires (Chadsey-Rusch, 1986; Halpern, 1992; Wehman, Kregel, Barcus, & Schalock, 1986). It is assumed that the same will be true for states that have received these federal grants, the first of which are due to expire in August of 1996.

Turf Issues

Each of the primary systems involved in transition policy implementation and service provision, special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation, are impacted by different federal legislation, administrations, funding, eligibility criteria, populations served, scope of services, service delivery mechanisms, program evaluation criteria, and personnel qualifications (Szymanski, Hanley-Maxwell, & Asselin, 1992). Additionally, systems desire to retain control over all, or at least a portion, of the traditional transition-related actions they have provided or administered in the past. In addition to any funding that may be associated with those actions. Because of these different factors, various turf related issues have arisen around transition-related policy implementation and service provision.

One way to alleviate turf issues is through a "centralized/decentralized" change process (Bryan & McClaughry, 1989; Clune, 1991). A centralized/decentralized change

process includes centralized, usually traditional legislated (i.e., top-down) actions, along with decentralized actions which include practice informed (i.e., bottom-up) actions. An example of centralized/decentralized change associated with transition may be the development of integrated federal and state-level policies prescribing coordinated efforts between the primary service delivery systems at the same time that special educators, vocational educators, and vocational rehabilitation counselors throughout the states develop numerous models of coordinated transition service provision.

Persistent turf issues may relate to a lack of cross-system knowledge by state-level administrators as well as local practitioners. According to Clune (1991),

> A teacher who attends a workshop on a new approach to teaching mathematics will not change math instruction in the school where she works unless the workshop process is replicated among the rest of the math teachers in the school. (p. 7)

By implementing capacity building instruments, in the form of integrated preservice and inservice training and technical assistance workshops provided to service providers from various systems together, states may lesson the boundaries that have traditionally separated the systems involved in the transition process.

Competing Initiatives

Transition is one of many current initiatives impacting the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation. In addition, special education is grappling with implementing inclusionary school practices, the role of special educators in team teaching situations, and developing alternative evaluation measures in lieu of formal standardized achievement tests. Vocational education is implementing and evaluating the effectiveness of tech-prep programs, struggling with decreasing enrollments, and expanding the school-to-work transition initiative to serve all students. Vocational rehabilitation is implementing supported employment programs, alternatives to traditional sheltered rehabilitation options, and serving individuals with the most severe disabilities first.

Each of these competing initiatives decreases the resources (i.e., material, human and fiscal) available to tackle transition-related policy and service provision barriers and issues. In addition, it is difficult to argue that one of these initiatives is more important than another. According to Coombs (1982) competing initiatives is a defining characteristic of educational policy analysis. Therefore, transition-related initiatives will always compete with other initiatives for resources.

Lack of State-Level Finacial Resources

As previously discussed, the sample states all relied heavily on federal funds to implement a number of transition-related policy instruments. However, practical concerns often arise, such as, when using federal dollars at the state level competition for resources and monitoring how resources are used. Each of these concerns can limit or delay policy implementation and service provision activities.

Localities have been given opportunity to compete for portions of federal funds by writing state-level mini-grants around various topical issues in States A and B. These states have funded numerous model demonstration sites and have provided outlets to disseminate the results and findings obtained from the models to other localities. A mini-grant competition was conducted using a blind peer review process in both States A and B. However, this format of funding model sites creates a dichotomy of funding winners and losers. This dichotomy may keep the losers from conducting progressive transition-related actions, while the winners jump ahead.

The second issue associated with funding state-level model demonstration sites with federal funds from the State Systems grant is that once those funds are awarded to localities, someone or some agency must monitor the activities and performance of the recipients. This is an additional task required of either the individuals hired through the State Systems grant or individuals working in an existing state-level agency. Additionally, contingencies need to be developed regarding the situation if a model site is not implementing what they proposed in their mini-grant application, or if they are misusing the

mini-grant funds. Each of these monitoring responsibilities must be undertaken and deletes time that could be used to conduct other activities.

The lack of state-level fiscal resources for transition-related policy implementation and service provision creates a burden for state-level agencies that must rely on federal funds. The lack of state-level fiscal resources heightens the competition for those scarce dollars and also adds new monitoring and evaluation responsibilities to state-level administrators. Each of these issues tends to slow system change.

The Personal Factor

All of the interviewees in State C mentioned that personal relationships with individuals in other agencies facilitated the implementation of policies that integrate the primary systems involved in transition-related service provision.. According to the interviewees, the personal factor expedites the flow of information, decreases the time it takes to develop pre-implementation activities, and facilitates any negotiation that may need to occur.

The personal factor should not be overlooked in state-level policy implementation. However, this amorphous entity is difficult to measure and describe. One goal of federal transition-related policy implementation is the integration of the state-level systems involved in transition-elated policy implementation and service provision. The development of positive personal relationships between individuals working in pertinent state-level systems should facilitate this goal.

Student-Centered Evaluation

Most of the evaluation activities being conducted at the state-level focus on student outcomes with little emhasis on process evaluation. Student outcome data is summative in nature and provides one measure of success or failure of specific policy implementation activities. However, it does not provide state-level administrators the opportunity to formatively alter or change policy initiatives while they are being implemented. The lack of policy implementation evaluation is problematic.

Formative evaluation that focuses on policy implementation facilitators and barriers would allow state-level administrators the opportunity to make procedural changes to policies during their implementation. Formative evaluation efforts that included local service providers and consumers could also add validity to the policy implementation and service provision efforts being advocated for at the state-level. Finally, formative evaluation mechanisms may uncover diverse methods of eliminating potential policy implementation and service delivery barriers, and then include a system for disseminating that information across localities.

State-Level Politics

Other findings that arose regarding state-level transition-related policy implementation related to the internal politicking of state-level governmental bureaucracies. McDonnell and Elmore (1987) believe that existing systems and institutions can work to blunt or co-opt system change policies that create new systems or alter existing systems because of perceived internal competition. Existing systems, or individuals within those systems, may have a vested interest in maintaining their authority and may feel that they have been bypassed, disregarded, or overlooked when shifts in authority occur. Again, as with the first problem of implementing system change policies, increasing the capacity of systems may decrease the politicking that occurs when systems are changed or altered through policy implementation actions.

Conclusions

Six major conclusions regarding the utility of the analytical framework been identified as a result of this study including: (a) system change appears to occur incrementally; (b) states use varying definitions of policy instruments; (c) states rely on past practice when implementing transition policies; (d) there is evidence of structural resistance within states to implement system change policies; (e) states implement symbolic policy instruments in addition to the instruments included in the McDonnell and Elmore (1987)

typology; and (f) capacity building appears linked to system change. Each of these conclusions is discussed below.

Incremental System Change

McDonnell and Elmore (1987) state that their framework is not hierarchical. In other words, there is no temporal or sequential progression associated with the implementation of the policy instruments in the framework. Implementing agencies do not have to progress in a sequential manner, for example from mandates to system change policies, but can implement selected instruments independently, or together, to achieve a desired target. This independence has already been observed at the federal level when OSERS funded transition-related inducements and capacity building instruments (e.g., model demonstration projects, research projects, a technical assistance organization), prior to the inclusion of transition-related mandates within federal legislation.

It appears, however, that states generally enact mandates, inducements, and capacity building instruments before they implement system change policies. Often, the implementation of one of the previously mentioned policy instruments is a precursor to implementation of system change instruments. For example, the implementation of capacity building policy actions, such as preservice and inservice training and technical assistance, increase the knowledge, abilities, and awareness (i.e. capacity) of state-level administrators and service providers, which lays the initial groundwork for the successful implementation of system change policy instruments.

System change activities can occur either quickly or slowly. Enacting a single legislative initiative can radically change systems, shifting authority between agencies, creating a new administrative unit, or altering funding schemes and mechanisms. However, system change in the transition arena appears to be incremental in nature. Although systems could be altered quickly through legislation, this does not appear to occur regularly. What does appear to happen is the primary systems involved in transition policy implementation at the state-level and service provision at the local level, remain intact

and changes within those systems appear to evolve over time based on increases in knowledge and broadening policy goals.

Varying Definitions of Policy Instruments

The policy instruments included in the framework developed by McDonnell and Elmore (1987) are precisely defined and operationalized. McDonnell and Elmore (1987) define each instrument in their framework (i.e., mandates, inducements, capacity building, and system change), delineate the primary characteristics of each instrument, and provide examples illustrating conditions that warrant the use of each instrument. However, state-level policy documents and transcribed interviews with key stakeholders involved in transition policy implementation do not always identify or use policy instruments as intended by McDonnell and Elmore (1987).

State-level policy documents and interviewees used the term system change to refer to a broad range of policy implementation actions and strategies, including instruments that would be technically classified as mandates, inducements, or capacity building tools according to McDonnell and Elmore (1987). For example, each of the sample states identified competitively funded state-level model demonstration projects as a system change implementation strategy. However, funding state-level model demonstration sites or projects is initially an inducement (e.g., funds used for the immediate production of something of value, in this case, funding for a model demonstration site), and also a capacity building instrument (e.g., designed to increase human, material, or financial resources). Funding model demonstration sites may lead to system change as the salient characteristics of these sites are studies, evaluated, and widely disseminated, but is not a system change policy instrument according to the McDonnell and Elmore (1987) framework.

This potential misuse of the technical terms developed by McDonnell and Elmore (1987) may be due to a number of factors impacting state-level policy implementation. First, dissonance may exist between research and the practical application of policy

implementation. Researchers contemplate the underlying meaning of policy actions, implementation strategies, and evaluation of outcomes associated with specific policy actions (Coombs, 1982). However, bureaucrats are more interested in the practical issues associated with implementation of policies and eliminating barriers that may impede implementation. Like researchers, state-level bureaucrats are interested in the conditions that underlie policy choices, implementation strategies selected, and outcomes associated with various policy actions, however, they are generally responsible for expediting implementation and are accountable for the outcomes associated with implementation.

In addition to focusing on practical issues associated with policy implementation, state-level bureaucrats are often suspended between the goals of federal policy initiatives and program administrators and the desires of individuals and localities within their state. Local administrators and constituents may advocate for different policy actions than those prescribed in federal legislation. Although the desires and initiatives of federal and local stakeholders are not mutually exclusive or always competitive, these conflicts exist and are rarely acknowledged in state-level policy documents.

State-level policy documents and interviewees do not appear overly interested in exact definitions of policy instruments, but more practical implementation actions. State documents and interviewees focused on actions associated with policy implementation at both the state and local service delivery levels rather than whether proposed conditions existed that may or may not influence the success of their actions. Again, this may be due to lack of understanding regarding the technical definitions of various policy instruments or the pressure from federal bureaucrats to misuse these terms.

The second factor related to the potential misuse of the technical terms included in the McDonnell and Elmore (1987) framework relates to the federal push for system change. The Secondary Level and Transition Services Branch within OSERS has been pushing states to implement system change policies, since the passage of the IDEA and subsequent authorization of the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities (State

Systems) grants. However, individuals working in OSERS are not employing the definition of system change policy instruments developed by McDonnell and Elmore (1987).

Although federal policy was not the focus of this investigation, it appears that the agencies directing education and vocational rehabilitation at the federal level are implementing a number of diverse policy instruments such as mandating transition planning, funding and monitoring model demonstration projects, research initiatives, personnel preparation programs, and the State Systems grants. At the federal level, each of these policy instruments are referred to as "system change" policies. Technically, these policies represent a broad number of instruments, according to the McDonnell and Elmore (1987) framework. It is possible that state-level administrators use the term "system change" inaccurately because the term is not used correctly by individuals at the federal level.

The appropriate use of technical terms to describe policy implementation instruments does not appear to be a priority at the state-level. However, understanding the technical terms and the conditions that facilitate the implementation of various policy instruments may prove beneficial for state-level policymakers and administrators. Additionally, the use of these terms at the state-level may clarify the expectations of local service providers who need to comply with state-level policy initiatives.

Past Practice

Change is difficult and there appears to be, at best, inertia against, or at worst, resistance to changing policies and practices associated with transition. As previously stated, states tend to address policy problems by implementing instruments that are familiar and have been implemented in the past. If a state has implemented a series of mandates around a particular policy problem, it is likely that it will continue to implement mandates around that problem. There are at least two reasons for this reliance.

First, policy implementers (e.g., state agencies) and the targets of implementation (e.g., local agencies) are both familiar with the necessary steps required to implement a particular policy instrument that has been used in the past. For example, if a state has previously implemented a number of mandates, individuals charged with responding to those mandates at the local level will be familiar with compliance issues, monitoring tasks, and evaluation requirements that accompany mandates. Concurrently, state agencies that traditionally implement mandates will have developed monitoring and evaluation strategies and, most likely, will not have to spend additional time training individuals at the local level regarding the expectations and requirements associated with mandate implementation.

The second reason pertains to familiarity and comfort. Using familiar policy instruments may produce more predictable results. In order to justify their existence, state agencies need to be able to prove that they are accomplishing their prescribed or developed goals. If agencies attempt to implement policy instruments that might yield unpredictable or questionable results, and those instruments fail to produce desired outcomes, the individuals who administer state-level agencies can find themselves with failed efforts and initiatives. Therefore, small predictable outcomes may be better, according to state-level administrators, than potentially large and beneficial yet unpredictable outcomes.

State-level agencies tend to institutionalize their practices and procedures, including the policy instruments used to implement various initiatives. According to a colleague with approximately twenty years of experience as a state-level educational program administrator, "there is comfort in maintaining the status quo" (Dr. T. E. Grayson, personal communication, October, 1994). In other words, state-level systems tend to implement policy instruments they are familiar with, rather than experimenting with different instruments which have different elements and monitoring requirements.

Structural Resistance

Representatives from the systems involved in transition policy implementation acknowledge that changes within their systems and across systems need to occur to better

serve individuals involved in the transition process. However, system change requires the transfer of authority between existing agencies or between existing agencies and a newly created agency, which often runs counter to the traditional goals of state-level administrators who assume that more is better (Dr. T. E. Grayson, personal communication, October, 1994). Therefore, it is unlikely that state-level agencies involved in transition service provision would be anxious to give up any authority or autonomy.

This creates a policy implementation problem, balancing the recognized and stated need for system change, and the vested interest key individuals working in state-level systems have to maintain the status quo. Very few state-level administrators are altruistic enough to "system change" themselves out of employment. Extreme examples of this exit at the federal level, where outdated and unnecessary agencies perpetuate themselves long after their practical need or value to society has vanished. Although this is not the case regarding transition, system change will require that current state-level agencies evolve, some broadening and others narrowing their scope, as policies are implemented that reflect the diverse needs of consumers and localities.

Symbolic Policy Instruments

In a behavioral critique of the work conducted by McDonnell and Elmore (1987), Schneider and Ingram (1990) have identified a fifth policy instrument entitled symbolic tools. According to Schneider and Ingram (1990), symbolic tools:

> ...may be used to encourage compliance, utilization, or support of policy, to appeal for self-initiated activities in the public or private sector that will further certain goals without the need for coercive or incentive driven governmental intervention, or to simply state goals and priorities thereby giving deference to some value over others even though no tangible actions are taken to promote those goals. (p. 519)

In other words, these policy instruments are symbolic, relying solely on the initiative of various individuals and agencies for implementation.

State-level interagency agreements appear to contain symbolic policy instruments. although these agreements stress the development of policies that integrate the systems at the state-level as well as service provided at the local level, these policy instruments were not identified during analysis. although well intentioned, it does not appear that state-level interagency agreements include more tangible substantive policy instruments and are symbolic in nature.

The State Systems grants appear to include some symbolic policy instruments. Each of the grants analyzed included language about integrating the systems involved in transition-related policy implementation and service provision. However, very few tangible actions could be identified during analysis designed to facilitate implementation of those policy goals. It is possible that in future studies the symbolic nature of various policies be examined.

Capacity Building is Linked to System Change

In order to achieve lasting system change, an unspecified minimum level of statewide capacity needs to be developed. McDonnell and Elmore (1987) state that without previously developing sufficient levels of capacity to address a particular policy problem that requires systems to change: "System change policies, then, have a tendency to devolve or degrade into incremental modifications of existing institutions and into more traditional mandates and inducements" (p. 144). Relating this statement to state-level transition efforts, unless the systems involved in transition policy implementation have sufficient capacity to support broadening or narrowing of their or another agency's administrative authority, system change policy tools will, most likely, not be successful. Therefore, capacity building efforts at the state-level such as training, technical assistance and information dissemination, may be a precursor to future system change policy implementation.

Framework Utility Summary

Three summative conclusions regarding the use of the McDonnell and Elmore (1987) framework as a tool to analyze transition policy implementation have been identified as a result of this study. First, McDonnell and Elmore's (1987) framework provides a viable topology for organizing and analysing multifaceted and complex state-level transtion-related policy implementation. Second, their framework has high face validity and is readily accepted by wide audiences including policymakers, administrators, and practitioners. Third and finally, McDonnell and Elmore's (1987) framework should be expanded to include symbolic policy instruments, such as the development of an advisory committee or a formal interagency agreement.

Recommendations

Five recommendations are made to assist state-level policymakers, administrators, and program developers in implementing policy instruments to integrate the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation. Recommendations include: (a) implement specific interagency policies; (b) link system change to capacity building actions; (c) conduct cross-discipline training; (d) provide state-level technical assistance; and (e) extend evaluation beyond student outcome data. Each of these recommendations are discussed below.

Implement Specific Interagency Policies

State-level transition policies need to make specific connections between key agencies. To date, most of these connections have been implied, it is now time for them to become explicit. Transition policy implementation and service provision may stagnate without explicitly developed interagency connections that outline each agencies responsibilities throughout the transition process.

The stated goal of federal transition-related policy implementation is to change the systems involved in implementation and service delivery. System change policy instruments require the transfer of authority among administrative agencies (McDonnell &

Elmore, 1987). It appears, based on analysis of results obtained from the sample states included in this study, that a knowledge base needs to be developed in states before effective system change policies can be successful. It also appears that the development of this knowledge base can be achieved through the implementation of mandates, inducements, and particularly capacity building policy instruments.

Another federal policy goal is the implementation of instruments that integrate the primary service delivery systems. Although federal legislation including the IDEA, the Perkins Act of 1990, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1992 all include statements about cooperation with other agencies, without integration at the state policy level, it is doubtful whether lasting coordination will occur. Therefore, the need exits for policy actions that focus on building state-level capacity, coordinating the efforts of agencies involved in transition, and changing the systems involved in transition.

Each of the sample states had some form of interagency transition policy advisory board. These boards served a number of functions including: overseeing transition policy implementation, discussing solutions to barriers to transition policy implementation and service provision, and conducting state-wide transition evaluation activities. These interagency groups appear to be an initial step in transition policy implementation and serve to increase the capacity of state-level transition awareness. However, the next step for these groups is recommending and advocating for implementation of integrated cross-system transition policies.

Link System Change to Capacity Building Actions

Capacity building policies appear to be precursors to system change policies. Until state agencies have developed a certain level of capacity and achieved a knowledge base regarding transition policy implementation and service provision, it will be difficult for system change policies to be enacted. State-level capacity building efforts should evolve based on the needs of localities and should continually change to reflect new information and needs expressed by localities. Without an extensive capacity building effort, it is

doubtful that system change policies will be implemented, and if implemented, whether they will be successful.

Conduct Cross-Discipline Training

One method states can use to increase the capacity of localities to provide integrated transition services, is by conducting cross-discipline training activities. By bringing individuals from various agencies together for training, those individuals would be able to observe the roles they play in successful transition service provision. Training activities that span disciplines tend to increase capacity, by allowing representatives from agencies to learn about the challenges and barriers faced by individuals from other agencies. This may force dialogue between participants, but this dialogue may last out of increase knowledge and understanding.

Provide State-Level Technical Assistance

Technical assistance that facilitates linking dissemination and implementation of state-level policies to service delivery and evaluation at the local level is crucial to achieving system change. This is particularly important for states that have one agency responsible for providing ongoing technical assistance to the key systems involved in transition policy implementation and service delivery. This will allow individuals from various agencies to have access to the same information and may lead to system change and integration.

Extend Evaluation Beyond Student Outcome Data

In order to understand the barriers and facilitators of transition policy implementation and service delivery, states should conduct both formative and summative evaluation efforts that extend beyond student outcome data. The formative evaluation activities should include an examination of the policy implementation process associated with the implementation of each transition-related policy instrument. This knowledge will inform policymakers and state-level administrators concerning potential changes that may need to be made in order to facilitate policy implementation and enhance the outcomes ultimately obtained by students involved in the transition process.

States appear to have more established summative evaluation procedures, primarily based on student outcomes data. This data provides one snapshot of the success attained by state-level transition policy implementation and service provision. However, other potential snapshots, such as the amount of time individuals must wait before being served and the number of times individuals need to re-enter various service delivery systems should also be assessed. Without this level of information, it is difficult to truly know the types of outcomes attained by individual students.

True system change will require the key players in state-level transition systems to alter their administrative responsibilities, procedures, and structures. It appears that a considerable amount of capacity needs to be built before lasting system change will occur. This capacity building effort should focus on integrating the policies that direct the actions of the various service delivery systems involved. Without this policy-based integration, system change will remain incremental and slow.

APPENDIX A

LETTER OF INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

Thomas R. Wermuth
Northern Illinois University
Department of Educational Psychology,
Counseling, and Special Education
DeKalb, IL 60115-2854
815-753-8445

November 9, 1992

Name
Address

Dear Name:

I am currently conducting research regarding the development, implementation, and evaluation of transition policies in states that received State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grants during 1991 as part of my dissertation. In order to gain an understanding of how different states are addressing transition policy issues, I am asking persons involved in transition from the systems of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation to participate in a brief telephone interview. The interview will last approximately 40 minutes and a copy of the protocol is enclosed for your review.

I am also asking participants to forward copies of any state transition policies or transition-related working documents developed as part of the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grant. This information will assist in the identification of unique features and commonalties between state-level transition policies. Additionally, supporting documents will enable us to determine the impact of the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities grants on the development, implementation, and evaluation of transition policies.

I will be contacting you by telephone within the next few weeks in order to ask if you are willing to participate in this study. If so, I will arrange a telephone interview at your convenience. Your personal anonymity will be ensured and your state will not be identified by name.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Tom Wermuth at home 815-398-6838, or work 815-753-8445. I will be happy to reimburse you for any mail, telephone, or copying costs incurred. I look forward to your response and to talking with you soon.

Sincerely,

Thomas R. Wermuth

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Interview Protocol

1. Has your state implemented any mandates regarding the provision of transition services? Please describe those mandates.

   Mandates are rules governing the actions of agencies and individuals designed to bring about compliance or adherence to administrative procedure.

   Example: The IDEA (P.L. 101-476) includes many transition mandates such as requiring that transition-related objectives be included on the IEP of individuals with disabilities beginning at age 16 or 14 when appropriate.

2. Has your state implemented any inducements regarding the provision of transition services? Please describe those inducements.

   Inducements are transfers of money to individuals or agencies for the production of goods or services.

   Example: The provision of funds to local education agencies if they collect specific transition related follow-up data for the state.

3. Has your state implemented any capacity building policies regarding the provision of transition services? Please describe those capacity building policies.

   Capacity building is the transfer of money to individuals or agencies for the purpose of investment in future benefits; either material, human, or intellectual.

   Example: Funding state-level model demonstration projects, funding state-level technical assistance centers, funding state-level information dissemination networks, development of a state-level transition curriculum, or funding preservice or inservice training for teachers working in the transition arena.

4. Has your state implemented any system changing policies regarding the provision of transition services. Please describe those policies.

   System changing policies transfer authority among individuals and agencies in order to alter the system through which public goods and services are delivered.

   Example: The development of an agency connected with, but outside of special education, vocational education, or vocational rehabilitation that controls the transition activities within a state.

5. Is your state evaluating the implementation of transition policies? How?

REFERENCES

Asselin, S. B., Hanley-Maxwell, & Szymanski, E. M. (1992). Transdisciplinary personnel preparation. In F. R. Rusch, L. DeStefano, J. Chadsey-Rusch, L. A. Phelps, & E. Szymanski (Eds.), Transition from school to adult life: Models, linkages, and policy (pp. 265-283). Sycamore, IL: Sycamore.

Berkell, D. E., & Brown, J. M. (1989). Transition from school to work for persons with disabilities. New York, NY: Longman.

Bolton, B. (1987). Outcome analysis in vocational rehabilitation. In M. J. Fuhrer (Ed.), Rehabilitation outcomes: Analysis and measurement (pp. 57-69). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1983). Educational research: An introduction (4th ed.). New York, NY: Longman.

Braddock, D. (1987). Federal policy towards mental retardation and developmental disabilities. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

Brolin, D. E., & Kokaska, C. J. (1979). Career education for handicapped children and youth. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Bryan, F. & McClaughry, J. (1989). The Vermont papers: Recreating democracy on a human scale. Post Mills, VT: Chelsea Green.

Chadsey-Rusch, J. (1986). Roles and responsibilities in the transition process: Concluding thoughts. In J. Chadsey-Rusch, & C. Hanley-Maxwell (Eds.), Enhancing transition from school to the workplace for handicapped youth: Issues in personnel preparation (pp. 221-235). Champaign: University of Illinois, College of Education, Office of Career Development for Special Populations.

Clune, W. H. (1991). Systemic educational policy. Madison: University of Wisconsin-Madison, Wisconsin Center for Educational Policy.

Coombs, F. S. (1982). Education policy. In S. S. Nagel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of policy studies (pp. 589-616). New York, NY: Marcel Dekker.

Daniels, J. L. (1987). Transition from school to work. In R. M. Parker (Ed.), Rehabilitation counseling: Basics and beyond (pp. 283-317). Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

DeStefano, L, & Snauwaert, D. T. (1989). A value critical approach to transition policy analysis. Champaign: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, College of Education, Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Institute.

DeStefano, L., & Wermuth, T. R. (1992). IDEA (P.L. 101-476): Defining a second generation of transition services. In F. R. Rusch, L. DeStefano, J. Chadsey-Rusch, L. A. Phelps, & E. Szymanski (Eds.), Transition from school to adult life: Models, linkages, and policy (pp. 537-549). Sycamore, IL: Sycamore.

Elmore, R. F. (1985, March). Policy analysis as a study of implements. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association, Las Vegas, NV.

Elmore, R. F. (1987). Instruments and strategy in public policy. Policy Studies Review, 7(1), 174-186.

Evans, R. N., & Herr, E. L. (1978). Foundations of vocational education (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Everson, J. M. (1988). An analysis of federal and state policy related to transition from school to adult life for individuals with disabilities (U.S. Department of Education Grant No. G00B43005 6). Richmond: Virginia Commonwealth University, College of Education.

Guba, E. G. (1984). The effect of definitions of policy on the nature and outcomes of policy analysis. Educational Leadership, 42(2), 63-71.

Halpern, A. S. (1992). Transition: Old wine in new bottles. Exceptional Children, 58(3), 202-211.

Illinois State Board of Education. (1987). Serving handicapped, disadvantaged, and limited-English-proficient persons in vocational education programs (2nd ed.). Springfield, IL: Author.

Johnson, D. R., Bruininks, R. H., & Thurlow, M. L. (1987). Meeting the challenge of transition service planning through improved interagency cooperation. Exceptional Children, 53, 522-530.

Laski, F. J. (1985). Right to habilitation and right to education: The legal foundation. In R. L. Bruininks & K. C. Lakin (Eds.), Living and learning in the least restrictive environment (pp. 67-80). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

Mandeville, K. & Brabham, R. (1987). The federal-state vocational reahblitatio program. In R. M. Parker (Ed.), Rehabilitation counseling: Basics and beyond (pp. 31-63). Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

McDonnell, L. M., & Elmore, R. F. (1987). Getting the job done: Alternative policy instruments. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9(2), 132-152.

Repetto, J. B., White, W. J., & Snauwaert, D. T. (1990). Individualized transition plans (ITP): A national perspective. Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 13(2), 109-119.

Rubin, S. E., & Roessler, R. T. (1987). Foundations of the vocational rehabilitation process (3rd ed.). Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Schneider, A., & Ingram, H. (1990). Behavioral assumptions of policy tools. Journal of Politics, 52(2), 510-529.

Snauwaert, D. T. (1992). Transition policy. In F. R. Rusch, L. DeStefano, J. Chadsey-Rusch, L. A. Phelps, & E. Szymanski (Eds.), Transition from school to adult life: Models, linkages, and policy (pp. 509-517). Sycamore, IL: Sycamore.

Snauwaert, D. T., & DeStefano, L. (1990). A comparative analysis of state transition planning. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), Supported employment: Models, methods, and issues (pp. 409-425). Sycamore, IL: Sycamore.

Stake, R. E. (1994). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 236-247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stowitschek, J. J. (1992). Policy and planning in transition programs at the state agency level. In F. R. Rusch, L. DeStefano, J. Chadsey-Rusch, L. A. Phelps, & E. Szymanski (Eds.), Transition from school to adult life: Models, linkages, and policy (pp. 519-536). Sycamore, IL: Sycamore.

Szymanski, E. M., Hanley-Maxwell, C. & Asselin, S. B. (1992). Systems interface: Vocational rehabilitation, special education, and vocational education. In F. R. Rusch, L. DeStefano, J. Chadsey-Rusch, L. A. Phelps, & E. Szymanski (Eds.), Transition from school to adult life: Models, linkages, and policy (pp. 153-171). Sycamore, IL: Sycamore.

Szymanski, E. M., King, J., Parker, R. M., & Jenkins, W. M. (1989). The state-federal vocational rehabilitation program: Overview and interface with special education. Exceptional Children, 56, 70-77.

Szymanski, E. M., Shafer, M. S., Danek, M. M., & Schiro-Geist, C. (1990). Supported employment in rehabilitation education. Rehabilitation Education, 4, 261-276.

Tooman, M. L., Revell, W. G., & Melia, R. P. (1988). The role of the rehabilitation counselor in the provision of transition supported programs. In S. E. Rubin, & N. Rubin (Eds.), Contemporary challenges to the rehabilitation counseling profession (pp. 77-92). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

Turnbull, H. R., III. (1986). Free appropriate public education: The law and children with disabilities. Denver, CO: Love.

Turner, S., & Handler, M. (1992). Data collector. Santa Barbara, CA: Intellimation.

U. S. Department of Commerce, (1993). 1990 Census of population and housing. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census.

Wagner, M. M., & Shaver, D. M. (1989, April). Educational programs and achievements of secondary special education students: Findings from the National Longitudinal Transition Study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Weatherman, R. F., Stevens, L. M., & Krantz, G. C. (1986). Passages to career: A framework for transition policy for mildly handicapped young adults. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Department of Vocational and Technical Education and Department of Educational Psychology.

Wehman, P. H., Kregel, J., Barcus, J. M., & Schalock, R. L. (1986). Vocational transition for students with developmental disabilities. In W. E. Kiernan, & J. A. Stark (Eds.), Pathways to employment for students with developmental disabilities. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

Wehman, P., Moon, M. S., Everson, J. M., Wood, W., & Barcus, J. M. (1988). Transition from school to work: New challenges for youth with severe disabilities. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

Williamson, J. B., Karp, D. A., Dalphin, J. R., & Gray, P. S. (1982). The research craft: An introduction to social research methods (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Wright, G. N. (1980). Total rehabilitation. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

Thomas R. Wermuth was born on March 14, 1962 in Madison, Wisconsin. He received a B.S. in special education from the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire in 1984, a M.Ed. in special education from the University of Vermont in 1988, and a Ph.D. in education from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in May of 1995.

Professionally, Dr. Wermuth has taught sixth grade in the Wausau, WI public schools and secondary-level special education in the Middleton, WI public schools. From 1990 to 1992, Dr. Wermuth was a Visiting Lecturer in the Department of Special Education at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign where he was the Director of Evaluation Technical Assistance at the Transition Research Institute (TRI). From 1992 to 1994, Dr. Wermuth was an Instructor in the Department of Educational Psychology, Counseling, and Special Education at Northern Illinois University where he developed and taught undergraduate and graduate courses on school to adult life transition focusing on adolescents and adults with disabilities. Currently, Dr. Wermuth is a Visiting Lecturer in the Department of Vocational and Technical Education at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign where he directs a research project conducting case studies of successful urban comprehensive high schools for the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (NCRVE).

Dr. Wermuth has written articles, monographs, and a book chapter on the development, implementation, and evaluation of policies affecting the transition made by individuals with disabilities from school to adult life. In addition, Dr. Wermuth has consulted with numerous state and local educational agencies on the development, implementation, and evaluation of transition-related policies and programs. Dr. Wermuth is currently working on two monographs for the TRI focusing on the implementation of state-level transition policies across the United States. In addition, Dr. Wermuth is developing a brief for the NCRVE on successful practices identified by teachers and administrators working in urban comprehensive high schools.

Thomas E. Grayson is a Visiting Assistant Professor in the Department of Special Education at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and Associate Director of the Transition Research Institute. Within the School of Education, he teaches a course on school inclusion and is an occasional guest lecturer on statistics and educational measurements. Within the Transition Research Institute, he is responsible for coordinating and conducting research pertaining to transition policy practices at state and local levels and evaluation practices of OSERS-funded model demonstration projects. In addition, he coordinates the provision of evaluation technical assistance to all OSERS-funded transition model demonstration projects, cooperating state educational agencies, OSEP regional resource centers, and other organizations providing data for evaluation research in transition program effectiveness.

Dr. Grayson has a wide range of experience in administering programs for youths at risk of school failure. While employed by the Illinois State Board of Education for 17 years, he was a senior educational consultant and administrator of alternative school programs for school dropouts and at-risk youths. In addition, he was a consulting research associate for the Transition Research Institute at the University of Illinois for 3 years. He is an experienced consultant to federal, state, and local educational agencies on program evaluation and has conducted numerous developmental training workshops on program planning, development, implementation, and evaluation.

Dr. Grayson's current research efforts are in empowerment evaluation strategies and educational policy analysis as it relates to special needs populations. He has been exploring a relatively new methodology called concept mapping which uses multi-dimensional scaling and cluster analysis to visually conceptualize (concept maps) complex educational programs and issues for the purposes of strategic program planning, implementation, and evaluation. This methodology is a bottom-up approach that empowers participants with information and insight on program practice and effectiveness. He has written several articles on the subject, the most recent titled, Concept Mapping, was written

for the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Dr. Grayson's policy analysis efforts involve the examination of federal laws regarding transition services for individuals with disabilities and how those laws are interpreted and implemented at the state level.

Finally, Dr. Grayson has extensive experience conducting workshops and seminars pertaining to (a) transition policy and practice in vocational, special, and regular education, (b) concept mapping, (c) focus group interviewing, and (d) evaluation theory and practice.

Transition Research Institute Advisory Committee

Joe Ashley, Ph.D.
Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center

David Baggett, Ed.D.
Modesto Junior College

Lizzie Caston
Family Resource Center on Disabilities

Sharon deFur, Ed.D.
Virginia Department of Education

Eugene Edgar, Ph.D.
University of Washington

Jean Elder, Ph.D.
Michigan Department of Mental Health

James Fairweather, Ph.D.
Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University

Sharon Field, Ed.D.
Wayne State University

Patricia Gonzalez, Ph.D.
National Association of State Directors
of Special Education

Rhona Hartman
National Clearinghouse on Postsecondary
Education for Individuals with Disabilities

Paul Hippolitus
President's Committee on Employment
of People with Disabilities

Richard Horne, Ed.D.
National Information Center for Children
and Youth with Disabilities

Betty T. Horton, Ph.D.
Schiefelbusch Institute for Life Span Studies
The University of Kansas

Carolyn Hughes, Ph.D.
Vanderbilt University

Margo Izzo, M.A.
Ohio Department of Education

David Johnson, Ph.D.
National Transition Network
University of Minnesota

Reginald Jones, Ph.D.
Center for Minority Special Education
Hampton University

Stephen Lichtenstein, Ph.D.
University of New Hampshire

Carol Massanari, Ph.D.
Mid-South Regional Resource Center

Craig Michaels, Ph.D.
National Center for Disability Services

Sidney Padgett
University Affiliated Program
University of Arkansas

Robert Stodden, Ph.D.
University of Hawaii

Mary Wagner, Ph.D.
SRI International